Śaiva Siddhānta Polemics:
A Translation and Analysis of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār – Parapakkam*

A Thesis Submitted to McGill University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Ranganathan Balasubramanian
Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montréal

June 2013

© Ranganathan Balasubramanian 2013

à Hélène, mon épouse,

partenaire indispensable dans mon parcours de vie

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a Tamil to English translation of the first part of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, called the *Parapakkam* composed by Aruṇanti Civācāriyār in the middle of the thirteenth century. The *Parapakkam* contains three hundred and one verses written in *viruttam* style; it is an amplification and illustration of the *Civañāṉapōtam*, the seminal and foundational work of Meykaṇṭatēvar, which became the catalyst in the formation of the Śaiva philosophical canon named after him—the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*. The *Parapakkam* is a review and criticism of fourteen systems of religious philosophy, including Jaina and Buddhist schools. The arguments of Aruṇanti are framed from the standpoint of Śaiva Siddhānta. The *Cupakkam*, which is not addressed in the thesis, is the second part of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār;* it elaborates on the basic tenets of Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy. Besides providing the translation of the *Parapakkam*, the thesis analyzes the language and methods employed by Aruṇanti to establish the superiority of his school of Śaiva Siddhānta over the competing schools with reference to the development of Indian polemical philosophy.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette thèse consiste dans la traduction, du tamoul à l'anglais, de la première partie du Civañāṉa Cittiyār, nommé *Parapakkam*. Composé par Aruṇanti Civācāriyār au milieu du XIIIe siècle, le *Parapakkam* contient trois cent un versets écrits dans le style *viruttam*. Il reprend et élabore sur le *Civañāṉapōtam*, travail fondamental de Meykaṇṭatēvar qui devint le catalyseur dans la formation du canon philosophique śivaïte et qui porte le nom de son auteur, *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*. Le *Parapakkam* est une analyse et un examen critique de quatorze systèmes de philosophie religieuse, incluant les écoles djaïnes et bouddhiques. Les arguments d'Aruṇanti y sont invoqués du point de vue du Śaiva Siddhānta. Le *Cupakkam*, qui n'est pas abordé dans cette thèse, constitue la deuxième partie du *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*; il développe les doctrines de base de la philosophie du Śaiva Siddhānta. Outre la traduction de *Parapakkam*, la thèse fournit une analyse du langage et des méthodes utilisées par Aruṇanti afin d'établir la supériorité de son école du Śaiva Siddhānta sur les écoles concurrentes en ce qui a trait au développement de la philosophie polémique indienne.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I consider myself very privileged to have had an opportunity to undertake and complete my graduate studies at McGill University. The entire academic environment with high caliber faculty members and the facilities offered is without an equal.

The Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill is a model that any institution of higher learning would like to emulate. The high standards of academic performance expected and demanded by the Faculty are worth all the effort in meeting them. I consider myself very privileged to have been part of such a marvelous institution and am very thankful to every member of the Faculty for their association and interaction with me in helping me achieve my goal.

I could not have come this far in realizing my dream without the counsel and guidance offered by my thesis advisor, Dr. Katherine Young. I would like to acknowledge the exceptional guidance provided by her, and I am especially grateful for her kindness.

Dr. Young is a towering source of inspiration and a driving force of knowledge, who always has time for her students. Her dedication to scholarship, her work ethic, and the ability to think critically are noticed and appreciated by all students who have come into contact with her. In my personal experience, Dr. Young has the astonishing ability to motivate me enormously, even with a brief conversation. I have had the good fortune of having her mentorship both at Master's and PhD levels.

I am also very much indebted to Professor Lara Braitstein, Professor Davesh Soneji, Professor Arvind Sharma, Dr. Maurice Boutin, and Professor Shaman Hatley (Concordia University) for sharing their knowledge with me. I am as well very appreciative of the warmth, and the exceptional support and encouragement I have enjoyed from Professor Patricia Kirkpatrick. My sincere thanks are also due to Professor Victor Hori for all his help.

As every graduate student at McGill knows, there is a silent partner in all research activities—the McGill library staff. Their support and help is invaluable

and essential. In particular, I thank the ever-helpful “inter-library loan” staff: Maria De Souza, Elizabeth Dunkley, Janice Simpkins, Cheryl Smeall, and Francisco Uribe. I doff my hat to them for their tireless service to the McGill student community. I also thank our Faculty administrative staff for their help and support.

There are two people in my life to whom I can never adequately express my gratitude, one in the academic front, and the other in my personal life—Dr. Katherine Young and my wife Hélène. Hélène has stood by me through thick and thin, motivated me and inspired me whenever I was floundering and flagging. But for her encouragement and her personal sacrifices, I could never have achieved my goal.

Un grand merci Hélène, du fond de mon cœur. « Le vieil homme et sa thèse, » comme tu m’as souvent appelé, a enfin atteint son but! With great pride, tempered with humility, I dedicate this work to you.

CONTENTS

Abstract i

Résumé ii

Acknowledgments iii

Contents v

1.0 Introduction 1

1.1 Overview 1

1.2 Translation and Transliteration scheme 4

1.3 Setting the stage: early northern and southern Śaiva Siddhānta 6

1.4 The *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* : authorship 35

1.5 The *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*: introduction to the text 42

1.6 Literature review 43

1.7 The *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* in the context of dialectics, debates, and polemics 50

2.0 Analysis of schools mentioned in the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* 61

2.0 Preliminaries 64

2.1 Lokāyata School 65

2.2 Sautrāntika School 70

2.3 Yōgācāra School 77

2.4 Mādhyamika School 78

2.5 Vaibhāṣika School 79

2.6 Niganḍavāda School 80

2.7 Ājīvika School 85

2.8 Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṁsā School 89

2.9 Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā School 91

2.10 Śabda Brahmavāda School 92

2.11 Māyāvāda School 95

2.12 Bhāskara School 98
2.13 Nirīśvara Sāṁkhya School 99
2.14 Pāñcarātra School 100
3.0 Conclusions 104
4.0 Translation 109
4.0 Invocatory Dedications (verses 1-11) 109
4.1a Lokāyata School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 12-32) 121
4.1b Lokāyata School (siddhāntin – verses 33-63) 135
4.2a Sautrāntika School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 64-94) 158
4.2b Sautrāntika School (*siddhāntin* – verses 95-134) 180
4.3a Yōgācāra School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verse 135) 224
4.3b Yōgācāra School (*siddhāntin* – verses 136-137) 225
4.4a Mādhyamika School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verse 138) 227
4.4b Mādhyamika School (*siddhāntin* – verses 139-140) 227
4.5a Vaibhāṣika School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verse 141) 229
4.5b Vaibhāṣika School (*siddhāntin* – verse 142) 230
4.6a Nigaṇḍavāda School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 143-150) 230
4.6b Nigaṇḍavāda School (*siddhāntin* – verses 151-164) 237
4.7a Ājīvaka School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 165-174) 247
4.7b Ājīvaka School (*siddhāntin* – verses 175-180) 254
4.8a Bhaṭṭa Mīmāṁsā School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 181-193) 258
4.8b Bhaṭṭa Mīmāṁsā School (*siddhāntin* – verses 194-203) 267
4.9a Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 204-205) 276
4.9b Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā School (*siddhāntin* – verses 206-207) 277
4.10a Śabda Brahmavāda School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 208-211) 279
4.10b Śabda Brahmavāda School (*siddhāntin* – verses 212-219) 281

4.11a Māyāvāda (Advaitin) School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 220-234).....285

4.11b Māyāvāda (Advaitin) School (*siddhāntin* – verses 235-252) 296

4.12a Bhāskara School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 253-254).....309

4.12b Bhāskara School (*siddhāntin* – verses 255-259).....310

4.13a Nirīśvara Sāṁkhya School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verse 260).....314

4.13b Nirīśvara Sāṁkhya School (*siddhāntin* – verses 261-263).....315

4.14a Pāñcarātra School (*pūrvapakṣin* – verses 264-270) 317

4.14b Pāñcarātra School (*siddhāntin* – verses 271-301) 323

Table 1. Distribution of verses in the *Parapakkam*.....345

Appendix 1 The *Civañāṉapōtam* by Meykaṇṭatēvar 346

Appendix 2 The Śaiva Siddhānta Canon : *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*.....351

5.0 Bibliography.....370

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

This thesis is about Śaiva Siddhānta (literally, it means the conclusion to which Śaivism has arrived[1]), a school of philosophy that belongs to the general sectarian tradition known as Śaivism, a Hindu tradition that considers Śiva to be the supreme deity or the absolute. The name Śaiva Siddhānta is used to describe both a northern Kashmiri dualist Śaiva school, whose scriptures and exegetical treatises written probably between the ninth and tenth centuries CE are exclusively in Sanskrit, and later, a school that was systematized in Tamilnadu and with many texts in Tamil from the twelfth century.[2] Today Śaiva Siddhānta is the predominant Śaiva school in Tamilnadu.[3]

An encyclopedic article defining Śaiva Siddhānta might read as follows: Śaiva Siddhānta recognizes three principles of reality namely, god or *pati*, the soul or *pacu*, and bond or *pācam*.[4] Śiva creates the world with the aid of the *karma*s of the souls. He is independent and conscious whereas the souls are dependent and the bonds are unconscious. Śiva is omniscient, omnipotent, uncaused, pure, and formless. He assumes several forms to favor his devotees. Such forms also facilitate his followers to worship him as a formless god who can be meditated on and worshipped. His acts are five-fold, namely, creation, sustenance, dissolution, concealment or embodiment, and liberation of the individual souls.[5] He is the

---

[1] *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Monier-Williams. s.v. "siddhāntin" (p. 1216)*.

[2] See GONDA 1977:155.

[3] According to Rohan-A Dunuwila, "The success of the Siddhānta was due at least to three factors: political influence, personal sanctity, and theological learning; without them the Siddhānta would have either remained a minor religious sect or receded into oblivion." Without any references to substantiate this claim, the author states "The Siddhānta monasteries, in addition to being centers of spirituality, became social and charitable institutions which took care of the hungry, the sick, and the homeless." See DUNUWILA 1985:35-36.

[4] The equivalent Sanskrit terms are *pati*, *paśu*, and *pāśa*.

[5] *Paṭaittal, kāttal, aḻittal, maṟaittal,* and *aruḷal* are the technical terms in Tamil for the "five-actions" (*aintoḻil*) attributed to Śiva. This process is elegantly described by Aruṇanti Civācāriyār.

"aḻippu iḻaippu āṟṟal ākkam avvavar kaṇmam ellām kaḻittiṭal nukaras ceytal kāppatu kaṇma oppil teḻittiṭal malaṅkaḷ ellām maṟaippu aruḷ ceyti tāṇum paḻippu oḻi pantam vīṭu pārttiṭiṇ aruḷē ellām."

efficient cause of the world, *Catti*, his conscious energy, is the instrumental cause, and *Māyai* is the material cause.[6] For a practitioner, Śaiva Siddhānta spells out a specific path to realize god. The four steps are *cariyai*, *kiriyai*, *yōkam*, and *ñāṉam* i.e. carrying out mundane religious duties of worship (*cariyai*), performing religious rites (*kiriyai*), and contemplation on Śiva (*yōkam*).[7] These three preparatory disciplines will facilitate the soul to receive the knowledge (*ñāṉam*). As the root of bondage is *āṇavamalam* or ignorance, it has to be removed by the knowledge. Then the soul becomes completely free of impurities and attains perfection. Even after release, the soul may appear embodied for a while, due to the residue of karmas (*pirāratta karumam*), but this in no way affects the soul's perfection. Śaiva Siddhānta also advocates the concept of *cīvaṉmuttar* (*jīvanmukta*).[8]

The Śaiva Siddhānta system suffers from neglect by early philosophers of Indian philosophy such as Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, Surendranath Dasgupta, Jadunath Sinha, and Mysore Hiriyanna. Although the details are still murky, recent scholarship is providing more information. Little is also known about the early texts in the Tamil philosophical canon, in part because there is a

---

Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Cupakkam 57.

"Destruction (*aḻittal*) provides rest; creation (*paṭaittal*) brings about the expiation of karma; preservation (*kāttal*) causes enjoyment; obscuration (*maṟaittal*) causes the mellowing [diminishing] of impurities with the help of karma; bestowal of grace (*aruḷal*) allows the soul to escape from bondage; all the functions of Śiva are but his acts of grace." The equivalent terms for the "five-actions" (*pañcakṛtya*) in Sanskrit are *sṛiṣṭi*, *sthiti*, *samhāra*, *tirobhāva*, and *anugraha* respectively.

[6] In a colorful verse in the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār*, the author describes Śiva's use of Catti, his consort, as follows: "Just as human beings use their hands to carry out what they wish to do, Śiva uses Catti to carry out whatever he wishes to do." Note the clever use of the words (*nam kai*) which means "our hand" as well as the "young maiden."

"naṅkaiyiṉāl nāmaṉaittum ceytāṟpōl nāṭaṉaittum
naṅkaiyiṉāl ceytaḻikkum nāyakaṉum." Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 78.

[7] The equivalent Sanskrit terms are *caryā*, *kriyā*, *yoga*, and *jñāna*.

[8] *Jīvanmukti* means "a state of liberation while alive and embodied." Although several definitions are used, essentially it indicates a state of being liberated or saved (however defined) while still alive and in a physical, although possibly transformed body. See JOHNSON 2009:157. A *Jīvanmukta* is a person who has attained the state of *Jīvanmukti.*

pronounced paucity of English translations of Śaiva Siddhānta literature.[9] I provided an analysis of the first two works of the philosophical cannon—the *Tiruvuntiyār* and the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār*—for my MA thesis.[10] They were composed in the twelfth century by two different authors, both named Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār.[11] I also provided an English translation of the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār,* which comprises one hundred quatrains of devotional songs written in medieval Tamil. I established the continuity of thought between the *Tiruvuntiyār* and the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* by mapping the verses of the latter onto the verses of the former. The *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* was not composed in isolation, but amplified what was revealed in the *Tiruvuntiyār*.

Here in my PhD thesis, I discuss the fourth book of the canon, the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* (the “Fruition of Śaiva knowledge”) by Aruṇanti Civācāriyār and will show its amplification of the third book, the *Civañāṉapōtam* (the "Instruction in the Knowledge of Śiva") by Meykaṇṭatēvar consisting of only twelve verses. With six hundred and twenty-eight verses, the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* is the largest of the fourteen books of the canon and is next to the *Civañāṉapōtam* in importance and authority. Because of the length of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* and the fact that it has received little scholarly attention, my thesis will provide a translation, from medieval Tamil to English, and analysis of the section called *Parapakkam*, consisting of three hundred verses. In addition, I will provide a brief evaluation of the development of Indian polemical philosophy.

The title *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* can be roughly translated as the “Fruition of Śaiva knowledge.” Aruṇanti coined it in the invocatory verses of his work where he traces his lineage and pays homage to his teachers.

---

[9] See section 1.6 of the thesis for literature reviews of Śaiva Siddhānta and the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*.

[10] BALASUBRAMANIAN 2007.

[11] The author of the *Tiruvuntiyār* was Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār of Tiruvāyalūr and the author of the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* was Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār of Tirukkaṭavūr. BALASUBRAMANIAN 2007:17.

1.2 TRANSLATION AND TRANSLITERATION SCHEME

1. All proper names of the deities are in Romanized Sanskrit (Brahmā, Śiva, Viṣṇu, etc.).
2. All names of schools/philosophies are in Romanized Sanskrit (Śaiva Siddhānta, Cārvāka, Sāṁkhya, etc.).
3. References to Tamil treatises are in Romanized Tamil (*Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*, etc.).
4. References to Sanskrit treatises are in Romanized Sanskrit (Ṣad Darśana Samuccaya, Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā, etc.).
5. Words such as god, first cause, and supreme being are not capitalized
6. For several decades, Indologists have employed the classical transliteration scheme, which uses diacritical marks. For the Tamil transliteration, I have utilized one of those systems provided in the Tamil Lexicon (University of Madras, 1982, page lxviii), as shown below.

அ	ஆ	இ	ஈ	உ	ஊ	எ	ஏ	ஐ	ஒ	ஓ	ஔ	ஃ
a	ā	i	ī	u	ū	e	ē	ai	o	ō	au	k̲

க்	ங்	ச்	ஞ்	ட்	ண்	த்	ந்	ப்	ம்	ய்	ர்	ல்	வ்	ழ்	ள்	ற்	ன்
k	ṅ	c	ñ	ṭ	ṇ	t	n	p	m	y	r	l	v	l̲	ḷ	r̲	n̲

ஜ்	ஷ்	ஸ்	ஹ்	க்ஷ்
j	ṣ	s	h	kṣ

7. For the Sanskrit transliteration, I have used the International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration (IAST) scheme, the most popular academic standard for the Romanization of Sanskrit. IAST is the de facto standard used in printed publications, such as books and magazines; with the wider availability of Unicode fonts, electronic texts are increasingly using this convention as well.

अ	आ	इ	ई	उ	ऊ	ऋ	ॠ	ऌ	ॡ	ए	ऐ	ओ	औ	अं	अः
a	ā	i	ī	u	ū	ṛ	ṝ	ḷ	ḹ	e	ai	o	au	aṁ	aḥ

क	ख	ग	घ	ङ
ka	kha	ga	gha	ṅa

च	छ	ज	झ	ञ
ca	cha	ja	jha	ña

ट	ठ	ड	ढ	ण
ṭa	ṭha	ḍa	ḍha	ṇa

त	थ	द	ध	न
ta	tha	da	dha	na

प	फ	ब	भ	म
pa	pha	ba	bha	ma

य	र	ल	व	श	ष	स	ह
ya	ra	la	va	śa	ṣa	sa	ha

ळ	क्ष	ज्ञ
l̲a	kṣa	jña

1.3 SETTING THE STAGE: EARLY NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA

The first reference to the term 'Śaiva Siddhānta' is in the Sanskrit Āgamas,[12] also known as Tantras.[13] The Āgamas are revered as authoritative revelation by all

---

[12] "I would like to repeat once more that the term 'Śaiva Siddhānta' is used in the Āgamas themselves to indicate the school of Śaivism they belong to, and that there was already a long tradition of ['Śaiva-] Siddhānta' (commonly referred to by this name by the Kashmir masters) in Sanskrit, before the Tamil school was born. Hence, the necessity to specify the school one is talking about by adding an adjective. The latter should not however be understood in a restrictive sense; we know that many a representative of the 'Tamil' school produced Sanskrit works as well." See BRUNNER 1986-92:260-261.

[13] While certain scholars consider the words "Āgama" and "Tantra" to be synonymous without any individual distinction, other scholars consider them indicative of their North or South Indian origin, respectively. They use the word "Tantra" to represent the scriptures of the Sanskrit Śaiva Siddhānta, and the word "Āgama" to represent the scriptures of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta (see, for example: DAVIS 1991:9.; JOHNSON 2009:6.; NANDIMATH 2001:1.; PANDEY 2006:11.; WOODROFFE and PANDIT 1984:3.).

"Sometimes the name Tantra is replaced by Āgama, Nigama, and Saṁhitā, especially when the texts want to emphasize their affinity to the Vedas. There is a convention that Śaiva Tantras or called Āgamas, Vaiṣṇava Tantras are called Saṁhitās, and Śākta Tantras are known as Tantras. But there is no regularity in these divisions" GUPTA 2005:4019 *(Encyclopedia of Religion)*.

"…'Tantra' is often scarcely distinguished from 'Āgama'. The Bhāgavatapurāṇa (4.24.62) alludes to people who are experienced in Veda as well as Tantra and the Sanskrit commentary by Śrīdhara explains tantra by āgama. In some older Tantric sources, the earlier literature of the school is referred to as 'Āgama'. Some Śaiva Āgamas must have been transmitted for some time in the North of India as Tantras…" See GOUDRIAAN 1981:7.

"On appelle āgama un savoir transmis de maître à disciple depuis des temps immémoriaux. Les termes tantra et saṃhitā en sont des synonymes. Le même texte peut être cité avec l'une ou l'autre de ces trois dénominations de genre…" BHATT 2000:20."From time immemorial, the knowledge transmitted from teacher to disciple is called the āgama. The words tantra and saṃhitā are its synonyms. The same text can be cited with any one of these three classifications…" (My translation).

Dominic Goodall takes exceptions to such positions and argues why they are distinct and different from each other. Goodall considers such a distinction of using the word Tantra in the North Indian context and the word Āgama in the South Indian context is unhelpful and not used in the primary texts. While commenting on the terminology of the twenty-eight Tantras, Goodall observes that there are as many as seven different names used to identify these works. *Siddhānta*, *siddhāntaśāstra*, *siddhāntatantra*, *saṁhitā*, *āgama*, *jñāna*, and *tantra* are the seven different names used to describe the same genre of work. In his books, he has chosen to use consistently either Siddhānta or tantra. See GOODALL 2004:xv.

Goodall further states that, "It is my impression that even the colophons in South Indian manuscripts of South Indian redactions of Siddhāntas almost invariably use the appellation tantra. That South Indian editors of works of the Śaiva Siddhānta invariably speak of āgamas does not

Śaiva traditions.[14] Because they are considered to be originally revealed by Śiva, they do not include the names of authors or dates.[15] Historically, they are

---

stem entirely from a coy reluctance to refer to their scriptures with the now sullied term tantra: neo-Saiddhāntikas writing in Tamil from at least the time of Aruḷnandi [*sic*] (see, for example, the second verse of the Civañāṉacittiyār) profess adherence to two classes of scripture: Vedas and Āgamas, the latter being the texts recognized in their time as Siddhāntas. The practice of these twentieth-century editors has served to reinforce the artificial distinction still erroneously supposed to exist between 'South Indian Āgamas' and 'North Indian Tantras.'" See GOODALL 1998:xxxvi-xxxix.

Hélène Brunner resonates with Goodall's views. "There is perhaps no Indian school where the pair of concepts "knowledge" and "action" (*jñāna* and *kriyā*) is given such prominence as with the Śaivas, especially in these branches of Śaivism that are more or less directly based on the Āgamas and go by the name of Southern and Northern Śaivism. […] It might be useful to remind our readers that these convenient appellations do not indicate the birthplace of the two schools, but the country where they finally took root." BRUNNER 1992:1, 38.

[14] "Śiva is the originator of the Āgamic lore according to the Śaivas. All available Āgamas are in the form of conversation between Śiva and Pārvatī or Ṛṣis. This points to the traditional belief that the *Śaivāgama*s are considered to be revelations and not translations." See NANDIMATH 2001:2.

Many authors use the word Tantra to represent the scriptures of the Sanskrit Śaiva Siddhānta, and the word Āgama to represent the scriptures of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta. Some authors use the terms interchangeably. See, for example: DAVIS 1991:9.; JOHNSON 2009:6.; NANDIMATH 2001:1.; PANDEY 2006:11.; WOODROFFE and PANDIT 1984:3.

"…'Tantra' is often scarcely distinguished from 'Āgama'. The Bhāgavatapurāṇa (4.24.62) alludes to people who are experienced in Veda as well as Tantra and the Sanskrit commentary by Śrīdhara explains tantra by āgama. In some older Tantric sources, the earlier literature of the school is referred to as 'Āgama'. Some Śaiva Āgamas must have been transmitted for some time in the North of India as Tantras…" See GOUDRIAAN 1981:7.

" On appelle āgama un savoir transmis de maître à disciple depuis des temps immémoriaux. Les termes tantra et saṃhitā en sont des synonymes. Le même texte peut être cité avec l'une ou l'autre de ces trois dénominations de genre…" BHATT 2000:20. "From time immemorial, the knowledge transmitted from teacher to disciple is called the āgama. The words tantra and saṃhitā are its synonyms. The same text can be cited with any one of these three classifications…" (My translation).

[15] "Les Āgama ne sont pas datables dans l'état actuel de la recherche, mais on ne doit pas être loin de la vérité en admettant qu'ils furent écrits entre le IIIème et le VIIème siècle de notre ère. Ces dates concernent les vingt-huit Āgama dits fondamentaux (Mūlāgama), tout au moins leur première partie lorsqu'ils en ont deux." See BRUNNER 1975-76:108.["The *Āgamas* cannot be dated at this time of the research, but we cannot be far from the truth if we admit that they were written between the third and the eighth century of our era. These dates concern the twenty-eight *Āgamas*, known as "fundamental" (*Mūlāgama*), at least the first part when there are two [parts]]." (My translation).

Brunner on Āgamas: "It takes the form of a body of specific instructions, which the God first revealed to some chosen divine Beings, who handed them down to the men, via a series of intermediaries forming a kind of descending ladder. At the bottom of this ladder, the men receive

diverse in chronological composition and are also diverse in content. Some scholars date the Āgamas from the seventh century CE[16] and others by their commentaries that are extant in manuscript form.[17] Still other scholars argue that some of the Āgamas existed in Kashmir[18] between the sixth and ninth centuries, because scholars contributed scholastic commentaries on several of them during

---

this teaching in the form of texts called Tantras or Āgamas. These texts therefore have Śiva as their author; and though their content has suffered the progressive simplification during the handing down process, to allow for the decreasing faculties of the recipients, it is assumed that they are composed of the very words of Śiva and nothing else. The Āgamas on that account are fully authoritative, as no other scripture (including the Vedas) could be. They are the present God makes to men to lead them toward salvation. For all the other ways, taught in various schools and supposedly salvific, or only blind alleys in the eyes of the Śaivas, or at best roads to some paradises from where the soul necessarily will have to descend." See BRUNNER 1992:5.

[16] There is a dispute among scholars over the dating of the Śaiva Āgamas and the associated ritual manuals called paddhati texts. While exact dating is a daunting task, there is evidence from external references suggesting that Āgamas were existing before the tenth century in similar forms as we have them today. Some texts reflect historical redaction and reworking over a period. It is reasonable to date them from seventh to tenth centuries. See KOPPEDRAYER 1996:49.

It is interesting that Schomerus, basing his view on several scholarly works, states: "So we can confidently claim that the beginning of the Āgama literature goes back to a time before the birth of Christ." It appears to be a controversial call! See SCHOMERUS 2000:8-10.

[17] For example, see Goodall's analysis in dating the Parākhyatantra. GOODALL 2004:xlviii-lviii.

[18] While there is a general consensus among scholars that the genesis of the Āgamas could be traced to the Kashmir valley in the North of India, there are a few scholars who hold on to the view that the Āgamas were native to the Tamil country which found their way to the North where they were translated into Sanskrit. According to Brunner," there was already a long tradition of [Śaiva -] Siddhānta (commonly referred to by this name by the Kashmir masters) in Sanskrit, before the Tamil school was born. Hence, the necessity to specify the school one is talking about by adding an adjective. The latter should not however be understood in a restricted sense: we know that many a representative of the 'Tamil' school produced Sanskrit works as well." Brunner could not have been more specific and categorical! (See BRUNNER 1986-92:260.)

Suryanarayana Sastri makes some interesting observations about the alleged Dravidian origin of the Āgamas. "One may remark, in passing, that the hypothesis of Tamil originals, while it is interesting, must remain barren in the absence of very much fuller material than we have, or can have, of a place long since washed off by the seas, and of the ancestors of a people long merged into, and brought up in the shadow of, an alien civilization. The etymological support, at any rate, would seem to be a broken reed: truths about ultimate things all more likely to be referred to a Being that revealed them than to a language from which they were borrowed; and the Āgamas, it may be worthwhile to remember, constitute the teaching of the Lord himself to His devotees among gods and men, the expression denoting, as it certainly does, that which is come from the Lord, — a revelation in short, — not a translation." SASTRI 1972:5.

this period. The Āgamas also vary by content—for instance, most but by no means all, are made up of four sections, or pādas, known as the knowledge path (*jñānapāda*), yoga path (*yogapāda*), rites path (*kriyāpāda*), and religious observances path (*caryāpāda*). However, there are a number of differences.[19]

The Āgamas recognize two types of schools: those belonging to the Mantramārga[20] and those to the Atimārga.[21] The school of Śaiva Siddhānta

---

[19] Nandimath provides an excellent and exhaustive review of the four divisions. See NANDIMATH 2001:37-64.

According to Brunner's research, only four Mūlāgamas out of the twenty-eight and two Upāgamas out of the two-hundred or so seem to distribute their teachings into the four traditional pādas. In her conclusions, Brunner offers some interesting hypotheses for the lack of quadri-partition and how they could have been modified over time. The *Jñānapāda*, the section on doctrine, sets forth the order of the world; the *kriyāpāda*, the section on ritual and worship, also outlines how one relates to that order. They complement each other in the knowledge that Śiva's order and action within that order are inseparable. The *yogapāda*, the section that provides knowledge of the subtle body, is subordinate to the *jñānapāda*; the *caryāpāda*, the section on day-to-day conduct, is subordinate to the *kriyāpāda*. Not all Āgamas follow the pattern and there are disputes among scholars because there is no clear line of demarcation between the caryāpāda and the *kriyāpāda*. See BRUNNER 1986-92:262-269.

"The various Śaiva Siddhānta authors differ on the precise demarcation between *cariyai* and *kiriyai*; however, they agree on the point that *kiriyai* involves a formal, ritual component combined with an attitude of devotion." See PETERSON 1989:45.

The four pādas clearly guide the aspirant by suggesting that, just as both "knowledge" and "ritual action" are essential parts of the Āgamic texts, one seeking the Śaiva knowledge within the world of Śiva should apply one to know that world and should act judiciously and properly within it. However, not all Āgamas assign the same importance to the learning "steps" in attaining liberation. Some Āgamas such as the Ajitāgama, assert that the aspirant could attain liberation solely through knowledge, whereas ritual worship provides only worldly results. By contrast, some other Āgamas claim that ritual action is a necessary component to attain liberation. See DAVIS 1992:107-109.

There are several variations in philosophical positions and methods of worship and liturgy. Instead, the Āgamas offer us a variegated, multiple body of Śaiva thought. See DAVIS 1991:13-14. There is a diversity of teachings within the Āgamas for the rules for rituals and worship; they present neither a single philosophically consistent doctrine, nor a universal unified liturgical system.

[20] According to Sanderson, a vast body of texts known as the Āgamas and Tantras are revered as authoritative revelation in all traditions within the path of *mantra*s (*Mantra*mārga). SANDERSON 2007:242-248.

[21] "Atimārga is one of the two main branches of Śaivism described in the Śaiva Āgamas or Tantras (the other being the mantramārga or 'path of *mantra*s'). The atimārga, which is entered on solely in order to attain liberation, is open only to ascetics. It has two divisions, the Pāśupata, and the Lākula, itself a development from within the Pāśupata tradition; both are concerned with

belongs to the Mantramārga. Alexis Sanderson reminds us that there are no historical records to determine unambiguously the lifespan, or even the presence, of Śaiva Siddhānta in Kashmir.[22] Still, most scholars, including Sanderson himself, accept Kashmir as the likely place where early Śaiva Siddhānta developed.

Between the ninth and tenth centuries, the Śaiva tradition of Mantramārga in Kashmir underwent a change by moving from scriptural anonymity to developing its own extensive body of exegetical literature. The metamorphosis resulted in two specific philosophical orientations, opposed to each other.[23] One, which eventually came to be known as the "Kashmiri schools,"[24] adopted a nondualistic path and accepted only the authority of the Āgamas. Early thinkers were Vasugupta (circa 875-925 CE), Kallaṭa (circa 850-900 CE), and Somānanda (9th century CE?). Both Vasugupta and his protégé Kallaṭa were vociferous opponents of the burgeoning dualistic system of Śaiva Siddhānta.

The other school of Śaiva Siddhānta recognized the authority of both the Vedas and the Āgamas[25]—and adopted the dualistic path.[26] Its doctrinal position was compatible with and followed the orthodox Brahmanic observances of caste

---

Śiva in his wild and terrible form of Rudra. See JOHNSON 2009:36.

[22] "The Śaiva Siddhānta itself has preserved no records of its presence in Kashmir beyond Rāmakaṇṭha the Elder, a contemporary of Somānanda. We know that there was an already well-established tradition in Kashmir at that time, but we do not know how long it had been there. It based itself above all on the works of Sadyojyoti: Nareśvaraparīkṣā, Mokṣakarikā [*sic*], Paramokṣanirāsakārika, etc.): and it has been assumed that he too was Kashmiri, and that he lived shortly before Somānanda. But there is no evidence that Kashmir was his home, and some [evidence exists] that he may be considerably older." SANDERSON 1988:690.

[23] See Sanderson's description of the split in the Śaiva traditions. SANDERSON 1988:690-701.

[24] It included the schools of Trika and Krama.

[25] "It [Śaiva Siddhānta] rests upon a twofold Scriptural authority, the Vedas and the Āgamas, both of them true, both being the Word of the Lord, but not of equal value. The Vedas are more general, a common basis provided by Çiva for all religions; the Āgamas are the more special, suitable for advanced believers and mature experience." See CARPENTER 1921:359.

[26] The terms "dualism" and "nondualism" as used in the thesis needs some clarification. Although there are three ontological categories (*pati*, *paśu* and *pāśa*) in Śaiva Siddhānta, many (if not all) authors label the Śaiva Siddhānta school as a dualistic school. I follow the tradition.

purity.[27] Early authors included the father and son pair, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (circa 950-1025 CE) and Rāmakaṇṭha (circa 975-1050 CE?), along with Sadyojyotiḥ (circa 890 CE) and Śrīkaṇṭha (circa 850 CE). These early writers of the extant works of Śaiva Siddhānta postulated the basic doctrines of the dualist school.

During the tenth and eleventh centuries, the scene in Kashmir was dominated by Śaiva Siddhānta dualistic exegesis,[28] but there was considerable exchange and competition with other schools. In fact, the very name Śaiva Siddhānta speaks to the fact of competition, because it refers to "the settled conclusion or the final position of Śaiva thought." The implication is that other systems were compared and considered before concluding that Śaiva Siddhānta was superior to them. If the system had developed in isolation without any challenge from other systems, the name would be meaningless.

Later, the influence of Śaiva Siddhānta waned in Kashmir. Abhinavagupta (circa 1014 CE) and Kṣemarāja (circa 1040)[29] contributed to its final philosophic decline in that part of the country, a decline that was abetted by the Islamic invasions. Śaiva Siddhānta[30] and other Śaiva schools[31] spread across the

---

[27] The Siddhānta, Trika, and Krama were not the only major Śaiva traditions in Kashmir. In addition, there was a cult of an esoteric form of Śiva, identified as Svacchandabhairava, and his female consort. Indeed, it was this cult, which seems to have been the norm among the Śaiva adherents of Kashmir from the early medieval period down to modern times. However, unlike the Siddhānta and the Trika, this cult was not the source of any distinct theological position.

[28] Whereas the Śaiva Siddhānta followed rigid caste bound ritualistic practices, the Kashmiri schools offered the aspirants an esoteric alternative that allowed them to explore their individual consciousness, even allowing them to consume meat and wine, besides permitting sexual intercourse as part of their contemplative worship. The Kashmiri schools endorsed the view that the entire cosmic process of creation of the world and its beings is the result of the play (*līlā*) of a superior universal consciousness. The school did not recognize the authority of the Vedas and developed a strong cult of Śiva, representing the universal consciousness, and based on the twenty-eight Āgamas. This was not acceptable to the Śaiva Siddhānta. According to them, there is a definite purpose behind Śiva's creation of the phenomenal world because he wants to cleanse the impurities of his creation and receive them in his fold. Although the schools differed in their doctrinal positions, both offered the same goal to the followers seeking liberation, i.e. release from the cycle of birth and death.

[29] "[…] commentaries Kṣemarāja states that his motive is to free the understanding of these texts from the dualistic exegesis that was traditional in his day." See SANDERSON 1988:700.

[30] "Over the years a differentiated picture has emerged of the historical development of the [of

subcontinent, each school assuming the local traditions of the geographic locations where it found sanctuary and followers. In their new locations, the competition was fierce, with each school vying for its own *niche*. As a result, several versions of the Śaiva religion flourished in different parts of India, with their own linguistic and cultural peculiarities,[32] although some schools came to dominate particular areas: for instance, Vīraśaivism in the Kannada-speaking south and Pāśupata in Gujarat. Śaiva Siddhānta found a safe haven in South India where Śaiva devotion was already active, nurtured by the Nāyaṉmār, the Tamil poet saints, from the sixth century CE.[33] According to Goodall, "It has become clear that many of the Saiddhāntika scriptures are comparatively late South Indian compositions which are never adduced as authorities by (and therefore almost certainly not known to) the masters of the school in the period in which its presence was pan-Indian."[34] Whereas the language was Sanskrit when the school flourished in the north, it was mainly Tamil in the south.

The name Śaiva Siddhānta in the Tamil context[35] seems to have been used

---

Śaiva Siddhānta] school, of its spread over the Indian sub-continent and beyond (to Cambodia) before it came (mistakenly) to be thought of as no more than a regional development of the Tamil-speaking South, and of its influence on thinkers of other persuasions, notably in Kashmir in the ninth to thirteenth centuries. " See GOODALL 2000:205.

[31] "The complex world of exegesis of the scriptures, the reformulation of their teaching and the organizing and hierarchizing of their contents indicate first and foremost this decision to emerge into the open, to escape from the dimension of a restricted circle of adepts—which is what must have been the original nature of these schools—and to offer itself implicitly as an alternative to the dominant Śaiva Siddhānta…" See TORELLA 1994:xiii.

[32] The Spanda, the Krama, the Śaiva Siddhānta, the Grammarians, and the goddess-centered Śakta school, to name the major ones.

[33] The Nāyaṉmār (Nāyaṉār– singular) were devotional poets and worshippers of Śiva and were active in Tamilnadu between the fifth and tenth centuries CE. The Tamil Śaiva hagiography *Periya Purāṇam*, a volume of the *Tirumuṟai*, written during the thirteenth century CE, narrates the history of each of the sixty-three Nāyaṉmār.

[34] The recovery of exegetical texts, which are similar and, in some cases, even identical in their practices and prescriptions, from far-flung locations such as the Kashmir valley and the Tamil country, reinforces the idea that the school became pan-Indian. See GOODALL 2000:205.

[35] "It has become clear that many of the Saiddhāntika scriptures are comparatively late South Indian compositions which are never adduced as authorities by (and therefore almost certainly not known to) the masters of the school in the period in which its presence was pan-Indian." See GOODALL 2000:205.

for the first time by Tirumūlar[36] in his *Tirumantiram*.[37] His date is a matter of

---

[36] Little is known about the real persona of Tirumūlar, the author of the *Tirumantiram*. He was supposed to have lived for three thousand years, and to have composed one verse each year, thus totaling three thousand verses of the *Tirumantiram*. There are several legendary accounts of him being a resident of the Himalayas and how he undertook a journey to the south to meet his friend Agastyar who was living in the Pothiya mountains. On his way to Pothiya mountains, he witnessed a dead cowherd called Mūlar and the cows of the herd were lowing miserably around the body, bemoaning the death. Known for his compassion, and because of his yogic powers, Tirumūlar (previous name not known) was able to leave his body and enter into the dead body of Mūlar and assume his identity, and hence his name, Tirumūlar. Eventually, he established himself in the village of Tiruvāvaṭuturai.

Tirumūlar himself claims to be a student under Nandi along with seven other students including Patañcali [Patañjali]: *nanti aruḷālē nātaṉām pērperrōm nanti aruḷālē mūlaṉai nāṭiṉōm nanti aruḷāva teṉceyum nāṭṭiṉil nanti vaḷikāṭṭa nāṉirun tēṉē. Tirumantiram 68*.

"By Nandi's grace, I became a Nathan, by Nandi's grace, I entered into Mūlan, what can I not perform by Nandi's grace, [and] by his guidance I remain below [here on earth]." Tirumūlar pays obeisance to his teacher Nandi in verses 67-72. (*kuru pārampariyam*). See NATARAJAN 1991:11.

According to Younger, "The traditional accounts of his life hold that he was a North Indian yogi or cittar who came to the South and through a miracle entered into the body of a shepherd boy named Mūlar." See YOUNGER 1995:192.

For more details of the legend, see ZVELEBIL 1995:677-678.; ZVELEBIL 1974:55-56. and NATARAJAN 1991:vii-viii. [Concerning the account of Tirumūlar taking care of the cows, a cynic might say it sounds very similar to Śiva taking care of the souls (*pacus*), and the Tamil word "pacu" also means a cow! A covert subliminal suggestion?]

[37] *kaṟpaṉa kaṟruk kalaimaṉṉu meyyōkam muṟpata ñāṉa muṟaimuṟai naṉṉiyē*
coṟpata mēvit turicaṟru mēlāṉa taṟparaṅ kaṇṭuḷōr Śaivacit tāntarē. Tirumantiram 1421.

Tirumūlar defines the Śaiva Siddhāntin in the following terms: "Śaiva Siddhāntins are those who have realized their true selves of a pure state devoid of ignorance after studying the scriptures and practicing yoga. The path of knowledge leads them to the sphere of formless sound. The goal of Śaiva Siddhānta is to be rid of all impurities."

The *Tirumantiram* is the tenth book of the *Bhakti* canon, the *Tirumuṟai.* It is an esoteric, and at the same time, an eclectic collection of three thousand verses For a succinct analysis of the *Tirumantiram*, see AYYAR 1974:204-284. It includes many of the great sayings of Śaivism, as well as a variety of aphoristic maxims. Tirumūlar composed all the three-thousand verses of the *Tirumantiram* in the same meter, *kaliviruttam*. "No other poet or devotional writer in the whole history of Tamil literature has written such a large volume of poetry in this singe metre." See ARUNACHALAM 1976:151.The treatise is full of analogies and references, but without a thematic order. Tirumūlar provides examples in his verses on "thought process and the sublimation of thought" with simple analogies. Even a casual student of the Tamil language cannot but admire the elegance of the verses and the clever wordplay!

poṉṉai maṟaittatu poṉṉaṇi pūṭaṇam, poṉṉiṉ maṟaintatu poṉṉaṇi pūṭaṇam;
taṉṉai maṟaittatu taṉkara ṇaṅkaḷām, taṉṉiṉ maṟaintatu taṉkara ṇaṅkaḷē. Tirumantiram. 2289.

"When you admire the gold jewellery, you do not see the gold. When you see [examine] the gold, you do not see [perceive] the jewellery. When you think of [concentrate on] the sense organs, you do not think [not conscious] of the Self. When you are thinking of the Self, you do not

controversy.[38] He praises Śiva for giving him a good birth and for enabling him to carry out his mission;[39] at the same time, he expresses his humility.[40] Tirumūlar enunciates his knowledge of Agamic/Tantric treatises[41] and practices but

---

think [not aware] of the sense organs." (My translation).

marattai maṟaittatu māmata yāṉai, marattiṉ maṟaintatu māmata yāṉai
parattai maṟaittatu pārmutaṟ pūtam, parattiṉ maṟaintatu pārmutaṟ pūtamē. Tirumantiram 2290.

"When you are looking at a wooden toy elephant, if you look at the elephant, the wood will disappear; if you [admire] look at the wood, the elephant will disappear. [Similarly,] If you think of the five constituent elements, [the awareness of] the body will disapper, but if you concentrate on the body, the constituent elements will disappear." (My translation).

[38] Many scholars have speculated on the probable date of Tirumūlar. Younger opines the date of Tirumūlar to be the third century CE. See YOUNGER 1995:83. Zvelebil dates Tirumūlar between late 6th and early 7th centuries CE. ZVELEBIL 1995:677. "Tirumūlar's *Tirumantiram* is very probably the spring and source of all āgamic texts in Tamil. This is the other stream of religious and philosophical thought, which ran parallel with the *bhakti* movement, only it was much less conspicuous and much more 'esoteric'. The poet, philosopher, and yogi Tirumūlar might have lived sometime in the 7th cent. A.D." see ZVELEBIL 1973:225. Ayyar suggests 6th century. See AYYAR 1974:208-209.

But Goodall argues otherwise: "The impossible dating on slender evidence of one particular Tamil author, namely Tirumūlar, the author of the *Tirumantiram*, to the fifth, sixth, or seventh century gives rise to a highly implausible relative chronology of the Śaiva Siddhānta." GOODALL 2004:xxix. I find the logical reasoning offered by C.V. Narayana Ayyar to be convincing, and one could settle for the sixth century to be Tirumūlar's date. Because his name is mentioned by Cuntarar in the Tēvāram, Tirumūlar must be earlier than Cuntarar (circa. first half of the ninth century CE).[38]

[39] *peṟṟamum māṉum maḻuvum pirivaṟṟa taṟparaṉ kaṟpaṉai yākum carācarattu*
aṟṟamum nalki aṭiyēṉ cirattiṉil naṟpata mumaḷit tāṉeṅkaḷ nantiyē. Tirumantiram 89.

"Our Nandi, who ever holds the bull, deer, and axe [is] the infinite god; this earth is [the result] of his imagination, and it contains [both] sentient and insentient objects; he has granted me this opportunity [birth]. He has planted his feet on my head." (My translation).

[40] *pāṭavallār neṟi pāṭa aṟikilēṉ āṭavallār neṟi āṭa aṟikilēṉ*
nāṭavallār neṟi nāṭa aṟikilēṉ tēṭavallārneṟi tēṭakil lēṉē. Tirumantiram 96.

"I do not know the way singers sing, I do not know the way dancers dance, I do not know the way seekers search, [and] I do not know the way searchers search." (My translation).

[41] The entire Book IV of the *Tirumantiram* deals with several Tantric *cakras* and *yantras*. For example, verses 914 to 1002 are devoted entirely to the Ambala *cakra* and to the mysticism of the letters of the alphabet, as well as to the sacred *namaccivāya mantra*. Early in the treatise, he establishes the greatness of the Āgamas (verses 57-66), and clearly mentions the twenty-eight Śaiva Āgamas.

añcaṉa mēṉi arivaiyōr pākattaṉ ***añco ṭirupattu mūṉṟu****ḷa ākamam*
añcali kūppi aṟupattu aṟuvarum añcā mukattil arumporuḷ kēṭṭatē. Tirumantiram 57.

"He who has the blue-hued consort, has the five and twenty three [twenty-eight] Āgamas
Worshipping him, the sixty-six sages heard this from his Fifth-Face." (My translation).

"Śaiva has five faces; the first four revealed the Vedas and the fifth one revealed the Āgamas."

expresses himself in a very cryptic manner.[42] "Tirumular (*sic*) shows acquaintance with Tāntricism of different shades and also with innumerable sects and schools of Śaivism but there is no evidence of an attempt to incorporate them into Śaiva Siddhānta. Śaiva Siddhānta does not emerge in clearly demarcated lines in relation to the Tantra and Śaiva schools of faith."[43] From the mixture of styles and wide-ranging topics, one could speculate that perhaps the *Tirumantiram* is a *collage* with contributions from several authors and schools, and, it was collated by one person, who could very well be Tirumūlar.[44]

Nevertheless, there are aspects of the *Tirumantiram* that suggest a connection with Śaiva Siddhānta. Tirumūlar claims to have descended from the sky,[45] and by his own admission, he appeared on earth to impart Vedic and Āgamic knowledge in Tamil:[46] "In the beginning," he says, "Śiva revealed two scriptures, the primal Vedas and the perfect Āgamas; The Vedas and the Āgamas gradually blossomed [matured]. [There is] no difference between Vedas and Āgamas.

See NATARAJAN 1991:10.

[42] Zvelebil considers that the *Tirumantiram* is so enigmatic because it is a siddha text. All siddha texts are "closed" texts in the sense that their true esoteric interpretation could be gleaned only when it is revealed by oral instructions through a guru. If we examine the accounts of the Jaina conflicts with Śaivism during the lives of the Nāyaṉmār, the victories won for the cause of Śaivism were through miracles, and not through controversies or philosophical disputations. It is clear that the value of the *Tirumantiram* came to be realized once the age of miracles passed away; the scholarship developed in the Tamil country (perhaps, with some help from the developed Sanskrit scholarship in the North) and philosophical reasoning became the norm in confronting the opposing religious views.

[43] See SIVARAMAN 1973:31.

[44] This is evident from the editing errors in the compilation of the *Tirumantiram*. For example, verse 448 is repeated verbatim again in verse 3011. Similarly, verse 490 appears again as verse 2012, and again as verse 3024. Perhaps many other repetitions could be found. Whether a single author or multiple authors composed the work, certain scholars, such as Zvelebil, claim that the linguistic style suggests an avant-garde contribution to Tamil literature (suggesting that many poets followed his style). Zvelebil suggests that it was Tirumūlar who was able to help the Tamil poets in expressing their thoughts. "In many ways, Tirumūlar is the Tamil poet, who by expressing his mystic and occult experiences, lingering on the border-line between speech and wordless thought, trained the Tamil language to express the ineffable." Many Tamil scholars might find this unsubstantiated claim difficult to accept. See ZVELEBIL 1974:55.

[45] *vāṉvaḻiyūṭu vantēṉē*. *Tirumantiram* 83. "Came by the way of the sky."

[46] *vētattaic ceppa vantēṉē*. *Tirumantiram* 77. "Came to explain the Vedas."
ākamam ceppalurrēṉē. *Tirumantiram* 74. "Explained the Āgamas."

There are nine Āgamas which expanded into twenty-eight."[47] Even the early Kashmir Śaiva Siddhānta accepts the authority of both the Vedas and Āgamas, as do the works of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta philosophical canon. Tirumūlar's concept of the nature of the phenomenal world and its threefold division of *pati*, *pacu,* and *pācam* also belongs to Śaiva Siddhānta.[48] In Śaiva Siddhānta, the five-syllabled *mantra* (*na-ma-ci-vā-ya*) encompasses all religious knowledge and ultimate reality, and the meditation on the five letters is considered extremely important.[49]

Whereas there are references to the *mantra* in Cēkkiḻār's *Periya Purāṇam* (circa 1150 CE), the authors of the first four treatises of the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ* do not refer to the *mantra*. It is worth noting that Tiruñāṉacampantar (circa 7th century CE) has an entire section in the *Tēvāram* called "*Namaccivāyat Tiruppatikam*" (verses 3320-3329)[50] which has a refrain "*nāmam namaccivāyavē*" (*namaccivāya* is the name). In the last verse of the section, he blesses his

---

[47] *mutalākum vētamuḻutu ākamam akappatiyāṉa īcaṉ pakarntatu iraṇṭu*
mutitāṉa vētam muṟaimuṟai yālamarntu atikāti vētānta cittāntam ākavē. Tirumantiram 2404
"In the beginning Śiva (*īcaṉ*) revealed two scriptures, the primal Vedas, and the faultless Āgamas. The Vedas and the Āgamas evolved into Vedānta-Siddhānta" (My translation). By introducing a new phrase "Vedānta-Siddhānta," it appears that Tirumūlar is trying to reconcile the Vedic and Āgamic traditions.

ākamam oṉpāṉ atilāṉa nālēḻu mōkamil nālēḻu muppēta muṟṟuṭaṉ
vēkamil vētānta cittānta meymaiyoṉṟāka muṭinta varuñcutta caivamē. Tirumantiram 1429
"The nine ancient Āgamas, over time expanded into twenty-eight (*nālēḻu*) and then into three divisions. Then into one truth of "Vedānta-Siddhānta" to bestow the rare and precious Suddha Śaiva." (My translation).

[48] The concept of the three ontological entities *pati*, *pacu*, and *pācam* are part of the basic doctrines of the Śaiva Siddhānta system. However, it is worth noting that they were referred to in the *Tirumantiram*, in more than twenty verses scattered across the treatise, and the *Tirumantiram* was composed several centuries before Meykaṇṭatēvar. For example,

patipacu pācam eṉappakar mūṉṟil patiyiṉaip pōṟpacu pācam aṉāti
patiyiṉaic ceṉṟaṇu kāppacu pācam patiyaṇu kiṟpacu pācam nil lāvē. Tirumantiram 115
"They speak of the eternal three: *pati, pacu*, and *pācam*. *Pati* is not affected by *pācam*, but *pācam* binds *pacu* [with fetters]. [However], when *pati* nears *pacu*, *pācam* will disappear." (My translation).

[49] There appears to be some nuance in the proper pronunciation of the *mantra* (*namaccivāya* or *civāyanama*). See PRENTISS 1999:150.

[50] See IYER and GROS 1984:327-328.

readers with a final message "*nanti nāmam namaccivāya*" (Nandi's name is *namaccivāya*).[51] Similarly, Tirunāvukkaracunāyaṉār (circa 7th century CE) with the endearing name Appar has a section in the *Tēvāram* with an identical name ""*Namaccivāyat Tiruppatikam*" and uses *namaccivāya* as a refrain (verses 4273-4281).[52] The last member of the *mūvar*,[53] Cuntaramūrttināyaṉār also uses the *mantra* as a refrain (*namaccivāyavē*) in the section *tiruppāṇṭikkoṭumuṭi* (verses 7723-7731).[54] Another poet-saint Māṇikkavācakar begins the *Tiruvācakam* with a call "Hallowed be *namaccivāya."*[55] We could see the importance of the *mantra* in the Tamil Śaiva *bhakti* literature of the poet-saints, and It is evident that the five-lettered *mantra* is not unique and exclusive to the Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy.

Umāpati Civācāriyār, in his *Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ*, the eighth book of the canon, dedicates an entire chapter to impress on readers the importance of the mystic formula of five-letters (*pañcāṭcaram*).[56] The presiding deity of the *mantra* is Śiva and Umāpati elaborates the importance for aspirants to understand its significance.[57] Umāpati could very well have taken the cue from Tirumūlar who also, in several verses scattered in his *Tirumantiram,* refers to the significance of

---

[51] Nandi (Nanti in Tamil) is the humped bull, Śiva's *vāhana*, or mount. See JOHNSON 2009:215.

[52] See IYER and GROS 1985:12-13.

[53] "The *Tevāram* constitutes, in the body of twelve *Tirumuṟai* (sacred work), the first seven divided between three authors; Ñāṉacampantar (I-III), Appar (III-VI) and Cuntarar (VII) who form the Śaivite "trio" (*Mūvar*), whence the appellation *Mūvar Tēvāram* frequently given to their work in its totality." See IYER and GROS 1984:xxxviii.

[54] See IYER and GROS 1985:437-438.

[55] "*namaccivāya vāḻka nātaṉ tāḷ vāḻka*." See POPE 1979:1.

[56] "The most sacred chant for a Saivite is the *'Namasivāya'* called *Pancākshara*, the five letters. The term *"Namasivāya'* could be traced back to the time of the Vedas. With the advent of the devotional movement, this 'chant' assumed the most exalted position in the Saiva canon. All the three *Tēvāram* saints Appar, Sambandar, and Sundarar, have sung the efficacy of the *Pancākshara mantra 'Namasivāya'*. Some of the miracles performed by the saints are also associated with this chant." See NAGASWAMY 1989:75.

[57] The *Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ* by Umāpati Civācāriyār is the eighth treatise in the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*. In ten verses (81-90), the author outlines the significance of the "*pañcāṭcaram*" (*ainteḻuttu aruḷ nilai*). He states that "Āgamas and Vedas and all other books are concerned with explaining the meaning of the five [letters]." (*aruḷnūlum āraṇamum allātum aintiṉ poruḷnūl teriyap pukiṉ*). (My translation).

the mystic formula.[58] On reading the *Tirumantiram*, one gets the impression that the five-lettered *mantra* is all that is required of an aspirant to realize the ultimate bliss of union with Śiva.[59]

Tirumūlar reveals his connection to devotional Hinduism but has little interest in temple traditions unlike the Nāyaṉmār. The entire universe appears to him as the dance of Śiva. He waxes over the joy of dance endlessly, and marvels at the beauty of the "cosmic dance" and the benevolence it confers on the erring aspirants.[60] Notwithstanding Tirumūlar's focus on the five-lettered *mantra* as *the* path for salvation, if we could summarize the *persona* of Tirumūlar in one word, it is "love" or *aṉpu*.[61] He declares that those who worship Śiva in all humility and love will attain salvation much easier than even the realized souls.[62] Tirumūlar

---

[58] *nammutal ōraintiṉ nāṭuṅ karumaṅkaḷ ammutal aintil aṭaṅkiya valviṉai*
cimmutal uḷḷē teḷiyaval lārkaṭkut tammutal ākum catācivan tāṉē. Tirumantiram 983.
For example, Tirumūlar instructs the aspirant "By chanting the five letters beginning with "na," is all the action you need to do. That will vanquish all the karumam [karma]. Those who hold the five letters in their heart will merge with Catācivaṉ [Sadāśiva]." (My translation) See *Tirumantiram* verses 908-987 for an elaboration of the important "five-letter" *mantra*. Verses 901-1002 are devoted entirely to the mysticism of the letters of the alphabet, as well as to the five-lettered and OM *mantra*s. See also NATARAJAN 1991:145-156.

[59] *civāya namaveṉac cittam orukki avāyam aṟavē aṭimaiya tākkic*
civāya civaciva eṉṟeṉṟē cintai avāyam keṭaniṟka āṉantam āmē. Tirumantiram 2718.
"Saying 'Ci-Va-Ya-Na-Ma' will focus your thoughts; all perils will be enslaved; Let the words 'ci-va-ya-civa-civa' fill your thoughts incessantly conquering all threats. There will be bliss." (My translation).

[60] *tāṉantam illāc catāṉanta cattimēl tēṉuntum āṉanta mānaṭam kaṇṭīr*
ñāṉam kaṭantu naṭañceyyum nampikku aṅku āṉantak kūttāṭa āṭaraṅku āṉatē Tirumantiram 2724.
"Endless Cakti is the abiding bliss; with her he dances the 'ananda dance' and it is honey-sweet. You have witnessed it; having witnessed it, dance transcending all knowledge. You then become the arena for [his] blissful dance [civāṉantak kūṭṭu]. Out of this dance emerge his five-fold acts of creation, preservation, dissolution, obfuscation, and revealing." (My translation).

[61] *aṉpu civam iraṇṭu eṉpar aṟivilār aṉpē civamāvatu ārum aṟikilār*
aṉpē civamāvatu ārum aṟintapiṉ aṉpē civamāy amarntirun tārē. Tirumantiram 270.
"The ignorant consider Śiva and love are two. They do not know that love alone is Śiva. When they realize that love and Śiva are the same, they remain in Śiva." (My translation).

[62] The concept of *jīvanmukta* ("liberated while alive and embodied"; *cīvaṉmutti* in Tamil) or "pre-mortem liberation" is accepted in certain schools like Advaita Vedānta, and Śaiva Siddhānta. There is a specific claim that full *mukti* (*mutti* in Tamil) is attainable during life as stated in the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār.*

also has several references to *bhakti* as a valid means of realizing Śiva.[63]

Tirumūlar, in his *Tirumantiram,* no doubt following the lead of the Nāyaṉmār, declares that there is only one caste and there is only one god.[64] Aruṇanti Civācāriyār (mid 13th century CE), author of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* also echoes Tirumūlar by declaring that there cannot be any love for Śiva without loving all his devotees (people).[65] However, inclusiveness does not stop Tirumūlar from heaping praise on one caste, the Brahmins, by dedicating an entire section (verses 224-237) extolling the virtues of its members.[66] Many scholars of Tamil

---

naṇṇiya ñāṉattiṉāl iraṇṭiṉaiyum aṟuttu
ñālamoṭu kīḻmēlum naṇṇāṉ āki
eṇṇum ikalōkattē muttipeṟum ivaṉtāṉ. Parapakkam 283.

"By worshipping and by the knowledge thus achieved, a soul may prevent both kinds of rebirth, never again to enter this world, or the nether world, or the world above, but achieve *mukti* here and now" (My translation).

The twelfth *sūtra* of the *Civañāṉapōtam* exclusively deals with the life of a person who is released from the bondage while yet living in the physical body.

cemmalar nōṉtāḷ cēral oṭṭā ammalaṅ kaḻīi aṉparoṭu marīi. Civañāṉapōtam 12
mālaṟa nēyam malintavar vēṭamum ālayam tāmum araṉ eṉat toḻumē. Civañāṉapōtam 12

Let the [realized soul], after washing off its impurities which separates it from the red lotus feet of the first cause, mingle in the company of the devotees whose souls are aplenty with love, remove ignorance and contemplate on his [Śiva's] abode. (My translation).

"I danced and sang, cried and sobbed and sought and found the great grace of Śiva. He permeated through me, uniting with me as the goal itself, through His own grace." See ARUNACHALAM 1976:163.

[63] *itupaṇi māṉuṭar ceypaṇi īcaṉ*
patipaṇi ceyvatu pattimai kāṇē. Tirumantiram 1454.

It is the duty of the humans to worship him, and performing this worship is true *bhakti*." (My translation). There are other verses such as verses 1585 and 1639 that repeat the message of *bhakti*. One entire segment "To be possessed by *bhakti*" (*pattiyuṭaimai*) (verses 2623-32) elaborates on the merits of *bhakti* and declares that it is as much a valid path as the yogic path.

[64] *oṉṟē kulamum oruvaṉē tēvaṉum naṉṟē niṉaimiṉ namaṉillai nāṇāmē*
ceṉṟē pukuṅkati illainum cittattu niṉṟē nilaipeṟa nīrniṉaintuy miṉē. Tirumantiram 2104.

"There is one family [caste], and there is one god. If you think of it intensely, there will be no more death [rebirth]. You can [thus] seek refuge with confidence. If you think of him [Śiva] holding him steadfastly in your thoughts, you will be redeemed." (My translation).

[65] *īcaṉukkaṉ pillār aṭiyavarkkaṉ pillar. Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Cupakkam 323. "…*those who do not love the devotees do not love Śiva either*…"* (My translation).

[66] A sidebar comment on Zvelebil. With a certain amount of trepidation in challenging an eminent Tamil scholar, I humbly submit that Zvelebil has somehow misinterpreted and thus skewed an entire line of thought and position of Tirumūlar. In his "*The Smile of Murugan*," commenting on verse 231 of the *Tirumantiram* (fn. 2, p. 226), Zvelebil states "Thus it

Śaiva Siddhānta ignore Tirumūlar and his contribution to the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, perhaps because his work, the *Tirumantiram,* is the tenth book of the Tirumuṟai, the *bhakti* canon. I venture to say that the *Tirumantiram*, though part of the *bhakti* canon, acted as a bridge between the devotional and philosophical streams of Śaivism as they were developing in Tamilnadu.

Another link between Kashmir and Tamilnadu is Aghoraśiva, a Śaiva Siddhāntin[67] who wrote many philosophical treatises in Sanskrit.[68] According to

---

[*Tirumantiram*] attacks caste-system and the Brahmins, whom it calls foolish and gluttonous." In the same footnote, Zvelebil continues to quote *Tirumantiram* and states, "There is one humanity and one god." How could Tirumūlar have such incongruent and inconsistent statements? I am of the opinion that by oversight, Zvelebil has mis-stated the position of the *Tirumantiram*. Let us examine the issue in detail. Verses 224-237 of the *Tirumantiram* describe the code of conduct of Brahmins (*antaṇaroḻukkam* or the Dharma of Brahmins). In painting a profile of what a Brahmin is, and what a Brahmin should be, Tirumūlar catalogs a series of virtuous practices observed and followed by Brahmins. He even clarifies what could be a caricature of Brahmins by saying that "a tuft and [sacred] thread alone do not make a Brahmin (*nūluñ cikaiyum nuvaliṯ piramamō*, verse 230)". In the several following verses, Tirumūlar states, "The Brahmins are the ones that seek the Samadhi state, they stand firm in following their religious duties, they concentrate on Śiva and seek eternal bliss, they chant the holy *kāyattiri mantra* (Gāyatri), by truth and penance they seek to realize Brahman," and so on. The misinterpreted verse states, what a Brahmin is not. "[Those] without truth, bereft of wisdom, lacking self-control, spiritually inert, empty of devotion, not grasping the divine truth are mad fools. They are not Brahmins, [I assert] (*pirāmaṇar tām aṉṟē*)" Zvelebil's statement is totally contrary to Tirumūlar's lofty praise of the Brahmin caste and their spiritual bent. Tirumūlar's dignified ideas in treating the entire humankind as members of one family is completely ignored by Zvelebil. A regrettable misinterpretation, indeed!

[67] See SANDERSON 2007:242-248.

Aghoraśiva was one of the important early exponents of the early Śaiva Siddhānta, and in his works he frequently reflects Rāmakaṇṭha's views,"…but expressed in much simpler (though by no means inelegant) language. […] and almost all the quotations he adduces to support his interpretations can be found also in the works of Rāmakaṇṭha." See GOODALL 1998:xxx-xxxi.

One of Aghoraśiva's gurus was a Hṛdayaśiva, although as Goodall points out, it is a controversial identification. See GOODALL 2000:208.

[68] Aghoraśiva (circa twelfth century) was an ardent champion of the dualist views of Śaiva Siddhānta. Although he lived in Tamilnadu, he wrote all his works in Sanskrit. In addition, he had several links to the non-dual Kashmir school of Śaivism. His philosophical commentaries provided the robust framework for the Tamil compositions of Meykaṇṭatēvar and his followers in the succeeding century. See SANDERSON 2007:242-248.

As Davis points out, the "…eminent Śaiva Siddhānta author of the twelfth century [Aghoraśiva] who although did not write in the Tamil language, did live and teach in Tamilnadu, and continues to exert his influence on ritual practitioners almost exclusively in Tamilnadu." […] In addition, Aghoraśiva commented on works by Sadyojyoti, Śrīkaṇṭha, Nārāyaṇākaṇṭha, and Rāmakaṇṭha II. All of these Śaiva Siddhānta authors, with the possible exception of Sadyojyoti, lived and taught

Dominic Goodall, they were “a group of exegetes who upheld the doctrines of the tenth-century Kashmirians such as Rāmakaṇṭha in twelfth-century South India.”[69] Yet another major development during the twelfth-century was the emergence of ritual manuals called the *paddhati* texts. Eventually, several *paddhati* texts also appeared in Sanskrit.[70]

To facilitate easy grasp of the essentials of the Āgamas, one Vāgīśa Munivar composed a Tamil treatise called the *Ñāṉāmirtam*, an expository manual based on the Āgamas.[71] According to Kamil Zvelebil, the *Ñāṉāmirtam*, the first significant Tamil treatise on Śaiva Siddhānta tenets[72] was composed by Vākīca Muṉivar (circa 1150-1200 CE) of Kōṭalampākai belonging to the Amparkiḻāṉ community, much before the compilation of any work of the canon.[73] Ampai

---

in Kashmir, at the opposite end of the subcontinent from Tamilnadu.” […] “It is only with the establishment of Islamic hegemony in North India during the thirteenth century that the Śaiva Siddhānta order appears to have become restricted in South India and especially Tamilnadu.” DAVIS 1986-1992:369-370, 376.

[69] Sadyajyotis, Śrīkaṇṭha, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, and Rāmakaṇṭha, “[…] all of whom belonged to tenth-century Kashmir, down to Aghoraśiva and his disciples, a group of exegetes who upheld the doctrines of the tenth-century Kashmirians in twelfth-century South India, are without exception dualists. Early non-dualist works of the school could have gone missing, but it appears likely that the old Śaiva Siddhānta was a broadly dualist school which only after the twelfth-century felt the influence of non-dualist Vedānta." See GOODALL 2004:xxvi.

[70] Certain scholars claim that manuals were written for private rituals while others claim they were written for public rituals. Hélène Brunner, in her commentary on Somaśambhupaddhati observes the following : "Les manuels ne sont pas écrits que pour les temples. Il y a des manuels destinés au culte personnel (*ātmārthapūjā*)…" […] Ātmārthapūjā est le culte que l'on fait pour son propre compte ; parārthapūjā est le culte pour le compte d'autres personnes ; nous traduisons le deuxième terme par "culte public", parce que, en pratique, lorsqu'il est parlé de parārthapūjā, c'est au culte qui se fait dans les temples qu'on fait allusion ; ce culte est fait "pour le bien du monde". BRUNNER 1963:xxii. "The manuals are not written only for the temples. There are manuals meant for personal worship (*ātmārthapūjā*)…" […] Ātmārthapūjā is the worship one does for oneself; parārthapūjā is the worship done for other people. We translate the second term as "public worship," because, in practice, when we speak of parārthapūjā, we refer to the worship carried out in temples; this worship is done "for the well-being of the world." (My translation).

[71] “The *Jñānāmṛtam* must have dealt with all the four *pādas, caryā*, *kriyā*, *yoga*, and *jñāna* at the time of its composition, although only *jñānapāda* has survived now.” See GANGADARAN 1981:vii.

[72] Unfortunately, many scholars do not recognize the contributions made by the *Ñāṉāmirtam* and label the *Tiruvuntiyār* as “…the first full-fledged philosophical treatise of Śaiva Siddhānta, enumerated as the first scripture (*śāstra*)." See ZVELEBIL 1995:702..

[73] See ZVELEBIL 1995:733. “*tamiḻil tōṉriya mutaṟcittānta nūl eṉṉum perumai itaṟku uṇṭu*.” "This

Caṅkaraṉār holds that Vākīca Muṉivar was also known as Vākīcacuvāmi, and was a student of Paramāṉanta Tirumāmuṉivar.[74]

The *Ñāṉāmirtam* has seventy-five *sūtra*s composed in *akaval* meter in addition to two invocatory *sūtra*s in *veṇpā* meter. The literary style employed by the author in the *Ñāṉāmirtam* for the most part is difficult to understand. Composed in classical *Caṅkam* literature style, the work excels in figures of speech providing pictographic similes.[75] Vākīca Muṉivar appears to be an erudite scholar of scriptures in Tamil, as well as Sanskrit. His Tamil scholarship is evident from the ease with which he expounds his philosophical ideas in Tamil using a colorful Tamil language throughout his work. One cannot but notice his rich metaphors.[76]

---

treatise is credited as the first Tamil Siddhānta work." See CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:xvi.

[74] *paramāṉantat tirumāmuṉivaṉ vaḷamali cēvaṭi vaḻutti uḷamali uvakai uṟṟaṉam peritē*. See CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:xv. In his invocation, Vākīca Muṉivar offers his obeisance to the feet of his teacher, Paramāṉanta Tirumāmuṉivar. Concerning the period of the author, Caṅkaraṉār argues that since Vākīca Muṉivar does not refer to any of the four important Nāyaṉmār, he must have lived prior to them, which would date him to pre 570 CE, prior to Appar (570-651 CE). See CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:xiii. See also ZVELEBIL 1995:682. Gangadaran, basing his observation on inscriptional evidence ("Rajadhiraja II, 1163-1178 A.D."), suggests that Vākīca Muṉivar flourished prior to the twelfth century, preceding Meykaṇṭatēvar by about one hundred years. Yet, in his notes (n.27), he states that Maṟaimalai Aṭikaḷ quotes the date of *Ñāṉāmirtam* to be in the sixth century CE (*Māṇikkavācakar Varalārum Kālamum*, p.210). See GANGADARAN 1981:9,127. Singaravelu Mudaliar, in the *Apitāṉa Cintāmaṇi* (*Encyclopedia of Tamil Literature*) has an entry for Vākīcacuvāmimaṭam. See MUDALIAR 1988:1401. This refers to the place where Tiruñāṉacampantamūrtti Nāyaṉār stayed when he visited Mathurai and debated with Jain monks and won them over. The entry suggests that this place could refer to the ancestors of Vākīcacuvāmi. If we accept that at *prima facie*, then it would date Vākīcacuvāmi at least a generation or two earlier to Tiruñāṉacampantar (circa 625-660 CE). See ZVELEBIL 1995:682. However, the evidence for such an early date is too slim to take it seriously, given what we know about the development of Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy in the north between the ninth and tenth centuries. While the exact dates are uncertain, all scholars seem to agree that Vākīca Muṉivar composed his treatise *Ñāṉāmirtam* before Meykaṇṭatēvar composed his treatise *Civañāṉapōtam*.

[75] For example, Vākīca Muṉivar has an illustrative explanation as to how he arrived at the name *Ñāṉāmirtam* (the nectar of wisdom) for his work. “When I churn the ocean of ignorance (*aññāṉamākiya kaṭalilē kaṭaiyum pōtu*), using my intellect as my hand (*putti eṉṉum kaiyaik koṇṭu*), using my master’s spiritual instructions as a rope (*kurunātaṉiṉ upatēcam eṉṉum kayiṟṟāl*), using the Āgamas as a churning staff (*ākamaṅkaḷ eṉṉum mattai nāṭṭik*), and the resulting froth is the nectar of wisdom (*ñāṉamākiya amirtam veḷippaṭuvatāl*). Hence, the name of this work is *Ñāṉāmirtam* (*innūlukku Ñāṉāmirtam eṉṟu peyar*). (My translation).

[76] For example, while attacking the position of the Advaitin concerning the unchanging nature of the soul whether it is in dream state or deep sleep state, the author states that the king is the king

In spite of his great erudition, the humility of the author is exemplary. Although well-versed in classical Sanskrit, the author composes the *Ñāṉāmirtam* in Tamil. He admits that he has not sufficiently mastered the linguistic forms of Tamil, yet his staunch desire to formulate the synthesis of 'truth' contained in the concluding sections of the special revelations, namely the Śaiva Āgamas, forces him to express himself through Tamil literary forms.[77] This admission that he does not know Tamil well clearly signals that he was a northern migrant and might be a key conduit of northern Śaiva Siddhānta to the south.[78] The contents of the treatise are so foundational that one wonders why it was not included as part of

---

whether he is in bed with a woman or fighting in the battlefield. Whether it is a golden lamp or a copper lamp, when they are lit, the light emanating from them will be the same. See CAŃKARAṈĀR 1984:38. Just as the appearance of light and the disappearance of darkness (*viḷakku vantatum iruḷ pōṉatum*) are simultaneous, leaving the human form and merging with Śiva happen simultaneously (*orē camayattil nikaḻntāṟpōla*) CAŃKARAṈĀR 1984:159. Humanity at large seeks pleasures in life. However, some experience pleasure, some experience pain. It is similar to how some farmers enjoy a good crop, while some others have a poor crop. Both pain and pleasures in life are the result of one's own karma. See CAŃKARAṈĀR 1984:45. The karmic effects cannot be annulled, and they have to be experienced. The effects of previous karma cannot be reversed. Clarified butter cannot become butter; curd cannot become milk; (sacred) ashes cannot become cow-dung; sandalwood paste cannot become sandalwood; just as earth has taken on the form of a wall, just as steel has taken on the shape of a spear, whatever was in the previous birth (the remnants of karma) will materialize in this birth. See CAŃKARAṈĀR 1984:88-90. Just as a patient does not get angry with the physician who cuts off a diseased limb with a knife, the realized souls are not dismayed at the destruction of the physical body due to karmic effects. See CAŃKARAṈĀR 1984:80-81. Just as mud caused by water is cleaned with water, the physical body created by karmic activity helps to assuage the effects of karma. There are many more interesting metaphors. In explaining the emancipation from bondage, the author encourages the student not to be dismayed by the nature of impurities. Using a clever metaphor, just as mud is formed from water and it is also cleaned by water, the body that causes merits and demerits, can be utilized to get rid of them also. "*cētakam payanta ceḻunīr cētu akam mācu ukamaṇṇiyatu eṉṉa ācu uka.*" See CAŃKARAṈĀR 1984:71-72.

[77] *uraicāl pakutip puraiyōr pōlat tamiḻttuṟai nirampāt taṉmaiyēṉai aṟattiṉ viruppac ciṟappōṭu tūkkap pāppuṉai pāṉmai nōkkiṉeṉ valittuḻi.* See Caṅkaraṉār 1984:8. "Not knowing Tamil grammar and not having other linguistic skills, yet, driven by a strong desire to have the ultimate knowledge, I have attempted to imitate the famous teachers and elders in writing this treatise."

[78] Krishna Sivaraman weighs in with his opinion that the *Ñāṉāmirtam* is a composition in continuation of the Āgama approach. "Śivajñāna Yogin thinks that *Ñānāmirdam* (*sic*) is only part of the 'general' phase of development within the *Śaivāgama* represented by the Pauṣkara, Mṛgendra, Matanga and other āgamas." See SIVARAMAN 1973:34.

the canon.[79]

The *Ñāṉāmirtam* elaborates on the existence and nature of three verities of the Śaiva Siddhānta system, namely god, soul, and bondage, besides dealing with other doctrinal issues.[80] Vākīca Muṉivar describes the five states of consciousness[81] and elaborates on the three impurities of *āṇavamalam*, *māyāmalam,* and *kaṉmamalam*.[82] The *āṇavamalam* hides the consciousness of the individual self even as the verdigris hides the bright luster of copperplate.[83] The *māyāmalam* is the material cause that also hides the awareness of the soul. One important difference between the two impurities is this: although, *āṇavamalam* provides uniform cover, the *māyāmalam* acts intermittently. The nature of *āṇavamalam* is to prevent the soul from being active, but the *māyāmalam* counteracts the influence of *āṇavamalam* on the soul. The author elaborates on *kaṉmamalam*, the third impurity, and its two kinds.[84] The *Ñāṉāmirtam* distinguishes the three ultimate categories of *pati*, *pacu*, and

---

[79] The *Ñāṉāmirtam* has been quoted fifteen times by the renowned commentator Civañāṉacuvāmikaḷ in his treatise Māpāṭiyam. See CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:xi. Civañāṉa Muṉivar (alias Civañāṉacuvāmi / Civañāṉa Yōkikaḷ) (1725-1785?) authored *Civañāṉapōtamāpāṭiyam*, a commentary on *Civañāṉapōtam*. See ZVELEBIL 1995:174-175.

[80] "*ñāṉāmirutam - vākīcarāṟ ceyyappaṭṭa oru caivacāttiram. itu tiripatārtta uṇmai kūṟuvatu*." "The *Ñāṉāmirtam*, authored by Vākīcar, is a Śaiva treatise. It explains the truth about the three entities." See MUDALIAR 1988:766.

[81] In *sūtra* sixteen, he describes *Cākkirāvattai, coppaṉāvattai, culutti avattai, turiyāvattai*, and *turiyātīta avattai*. The five states of consciousness are wakeful state, dream state, deep sleep state, the fourth state and the fifth state. The Sanskrit terms are *jāgrat avasthā*, *svapna avasthā*, *suṣuptaavasthā*, *turīya avasthā*, and *turīyātīta avasthā*. See CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:31-35.

[82] In *sūtra*s nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one respectively*, yāṉē iṉṉaṉ āyiṉēṉ yeṉ cēr āṉāp pācam aṟiyal virumpiṉēṉ aṟava! eṉṉa, aruḷōṉ aṟaiyiṉ kuṟaiyā mummalak kottē muṟai tēr*. See CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:38. Bondage is caused by three elements, that is, *āṇavam*, *māyai*, and *kaṉmam*.

Śaiva Siddhānta admits five eternal substances: *Pati* (god), *Pacu* (beings), *Māyai* (the material cause, and what evolves from it), *Karumam* (good and bad deeds and their results), and *āṇavamalam* (the fundamental evil or defilement). The last three are grouped together, and called *pācam* or *bandham* (fetters) or malam (defilement). Thus, the three ontological categories recognized by the system are god, the selves, and the principles of bondage.

[83] *pēṇiṉ cempiṉ peruku iruntukaḷ eṉa aṟiviṉai maṟaittal aṇimalam*. See CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:38.

[84] In *sūtra* eighteen. *kaṉmam puṇyam pāvam eṉa iraṇṭām* CAṄKARAṈĀR 1984:41. Karma is of two kinds; good karma results from moral or religious acts causing merit and bad karma results from sinful acts causing demerit.

pācam.[85]

The text does not discuss the relationship between the self and god. It confines its attention only to the four parts of the Śaivāgamas to the exclusion of the Vedas, perhaps offering some clues to the author's northern origins.[86] The *Ñāṉāmirtam* also provides analysis of the internal organ, the sense organs, the motor organs, and the various kinds of airs associated with them in an elaborate manner.[87] It is not too farfetched to suggest that the *Ñāṉāmirtam* is an antecedent of the *Civañāṉapōtam*, the third book of the philosophical canon with reference to the nature of the self, the state of its bondage, and the final release.

A full study of the Tamil *bhakti* texts, the works of the Nāyaṉmār, from the sixth to the ninth centuries is relevant by way of background to the works of the philosophical canon. However, as there are now a number of good scholarly works on them, they will not be discussed here. Suffice it to say by way of introduction that the burgeoning tradition of Śaiva Siddhānta coalesced with local Tamil religious culture to create two distinct currents - one devotional (*bhakti*), and the other philosophical (*ñāṉam*). These, in turn, gave rise to two canons composed in Tamil. The *Tirumuṟai,* a collection of twelve books of poetic hymns, was compiled by Nampi Āṇṭār Nampi (circa 1100 CE); the poems express the devotional experiences of the Nāyaṉmār (the Tamil poet-saints). The *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*, the second canon, is a collection of fourteen theo-philosophical expositions consolidated in the fourteenth century by Umāpati Civācāriyār.

I turn now to antecedents to the philosophical canon proper, more specifically, its first two texts, the *Tiruvuntiyār* and the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār*. A cursory examination of these treatises shows that the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* is an extension or amplification of the *Tiruvuntiyār*. The *Tiruvuntiyār* and the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār*

---

[85] In *sūtra* eight. *pacu pācattōṭu pati āy peṟṟi matiyōr pacu mūvakai eṉa matippar*. See CAṄKARAṆĀR 1984:14-18. The knowledge path identifies the three categories of *pati*, *pacu*, and *pācam*. *Pacu* undergoes three states of *kēvalaṉ*, *cakalaṉ*, and *cuttaṉ*.

[86] The non-dualist schools of Kashmir recognize the Āgamas (Tantras) as authoritative but they do not accept the authority of the Vedas.

[87] Civañāṉa Muṉivar, in his *Civañāṉa Māpāṭīyam*, (1725-1785 CE) elaborates on these ideas quoting the *Ñāṉāmirtam*. MUDALIAR 1985:33,36,101,116-118, 153, 155 and 253.

act as a bridge between the *Tirumuṟai* literature and the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ* treatises, because they link the devotional (*bhakti*) path to the knowledge (*ñāṉam*) path. The devotee communicates directly with Śiva, "melts away," and feels in unison with him. Neither the words *bhakti* nor *aṉpu* is used in the *Tiruvuntiyār*. Instead, two key words expressing the idea of *bhakti* are found: *uḷḷamurukki* and *paṟṟu*. The former implies intense love for Śiva that melts the devotee's heart; and the latter, attachment to Śiva that destroys attachment to the self or to the world.[88]

The *Tiruvuntiyār* (mid-tweflth century), is by Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār from Tiruviyalūr.[89] His treatise is called the *Tiruvuntiyār* because all forty-five *sūtra*s are composed in *untīpaṟa* metre[90] or because the name is based on the refrain *untīpaṟa* used in every *sūtra*.[91] Legend has it that Tiruviyalūr Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār authored this treatise at the request of one of his students.[92]

Of the four Āgamic paths of *kiriyai* (Sanskrit *kriyā pāda*), *cariyai* (Sanskrit *caryā pāda*), *yōkam* (Sanskrit *yoga pāda*), and *ñāṉam* (Sanskrit *jñāna pāda*), the author's focus in the *Tiruvuntiyār* is on the path of *ñāṉam*, while addressing the path of *yōkam* marginally. He also emphasizes that the soul can extricate itself from the mire of impurities and darkness only by being conscious of the grace bestowed by Śiva (*avaṉkaṇ aruḷai maṟavātē*) and the aspirant's focus on love for

---

[88] See DHAVAMONY 1971:179.

[89] See BALASUBRAMANIAN 2007:117.

[90] See DHAVAMONY 1971:175.

[91] *'untī paṟa' 'untī paṟa' eṉa ovvoru tāḻicaiyum muṭivuṟuvatāl untiyār eṉum peyar amaintatu*. See IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988:vii-viii.

[92] Whereas Dhavamony states that Tirukkaṭavūr Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār was a direct disciple of Tiruviyalūr Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār. "Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār of Tirukkaṭavūr, who was according to tradition a disciple of Uyyavanta Tēvar of Tiruviyalūr, composed this work probably about A.D. 1177." (Year 1099 of Cālivāhana cahāptam). See DHAVAMONY 1971:183. T.B. Siddlingaiah submits that the author of the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* was the student of one "Āḷuḍaiya Dēva Nāyaṉār" who, in turn, was the student of Tiruviyalūr Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār.[92] Singaravelu Mudaliar agrees with Siddlingaiah without mentioning the name of the intermediate teacher. MUDALIAR 1988:248. I would surmise that it is very unlikely that there could have been an intermediate teacher because the two treatises were composed thirty years apart, and the gap cannot accommodate another generation.

Śiva.[93] When Śiva possesses the soul in such a way, the soul undergoes a spiritual experience of Śiva's nature. There is mutual sharing, the soul surrendering to Śiva, and Śiva giving himself to the soul (*taṉceyal tāṉē…taṉṉaiyē tantāṉ*) in return.[94] When united with Śiva, the soul achieves oneness with him, and Śiva takes possession of the soul completely.[95] Then all duality at the conscious level will be lost. This union with Śiva is precipitated by the soul's concentration on Śiva, that is, the soul thinks only of Śiva's grace. The author cautions that Śiva is one with the soul only in the realms of knowledge and love, and not in an ontological sense.[96]

The author of the *Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār* has the same name as the author of the *Tiruvuntiyār*. However, the author of the former, Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār, is from a different hometown, Tirukkaṭavūr. Likely born in late twelfth century,[97] perhaps as a member of a non-brahmin caste, he did not enjoy any social recognition.[98] The tradition maintains that his work was rejected by the scholars of his time, but he was determined that it be recognized. He went to the temple at Citamparam and placed his work on the first step of the altar. The black-stone elephant on the side of the step lifted the work with its trunk and placed it at the feet of Lord Naṭarājā, the presiding deity at the temple. This miraculous event changed the minds of all the scholars who had earlier rejected it. Hence the name

---

[93] *maruḷum teruḷum maṟakkum avaṉkaṇ*
aruḷai maṟavātē untīpaṟa
atuvē iṅku uḷḷatu eṉṟu untīpaṟa. Tiruvuntiyār 18.

[94] *nam ceyal aṟṟu inta nām aṟṟapiṉ, nātaṉ*
taṉceyal tāṉē eṉṟu untīpaṟa
taṉṉaiyē tantāṉ eṉṟu untīpaṟa. Tiruvuntiyār 6.

[95] *ēkaṉuk āki aṉēkaṉum āṉavaṉ*
nātaṉum āṉāṉ eṉṟu untīpaṟa
nammaiyē āṇṭāṉ eṉṟu untīpaṟa. Tiruvuntiyār 5.

[96] *avaṉ ivaṉ āṉatu avaṉaruḷāl allatu*
ivaṉ avaṉ ākāṉ eṉṟu untīpaṟa
eṉṟum ivaṉē aṉṟu untīpaṟa. Tiruvuntiyār 40.

[97] BALASUBRAMANIAN 2007:117.

[98] The author addresses his student as O! Brahmin! (*vētiyaṉē*). It suggests either that the author was not a Brahmin, or that he displays extreme modesty in addressing his student. Most likely, the former is the case (*Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār 17*).

Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār, meaning that which was placed on the step by an elephant.[99] In its one hundred *sūtra*s in *veṇpā* meter, it elaborates on the forty-four *sūtra*s of the *Tiruvuntiyār*.[100]

The *Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār* is in the format of a discourse offered by a teacher to his student(s). Among several teachings, he extols the virtues of both paths of *bhakti* and *ñāṉam.* The choice is up to the student. In expounding the subtle nature of *bhakti,* moreover, the teacher tells the student that if he destroys the awareness of duality, Śiva will manifest himself with his consort (*aruḷ catti*) (*uḷḷum puṟampum niṉaippoḻiyil uṉṉiṭaiyē vaḷḷal eḻuntaruḷum mātiṉoṭum*). He exhorts the student to choose between the path of knowledge and the path of love (*aṟivu neṟi* or *aṉpu neṟi*). The student could choose to either study the scriptures for true knowledge, or acquire the same knowledge through love of Śiva. By saying, "do something" (*ētēṉuñ cey*), he wants the student to deliberate and make a choice.[101]

The *Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār* makes more than twenty-five references to the miracles attributed to the Nāyaṉmār in the *Periya Purāṇam*. Without offering an alternative path to *bhakti*, the author suggests that the path of knowledge, dovetails with the *bhakti* path. He is astute enough not to alienate or antagonize the followers of the *bhakti* tradition but suggests an adjunct. The author also juxtaposes two spiritual paths available to the student, which are practiced by the Śaiva saints in their worldly presence. The first one refers to the path of devotion (*akamārkkam*) and the second refers to the choice of the *yogi*s (*Yōkikaḷ*) and their austerities (*sakamārkam*). The superior nature of *akamārkkam* over

---

[99] See SIDDALINGAIAH 1979:85-86.

[100] An appendix in my M.A. thesis maps the thematic correlation between the two works BALASUBRAMANIAN 2007:130-133.

[101] *uḷḷum puṟampum niṉaippoḻiyil uṉṉiṭaiyē vaḷḷal eḻuntaruḷum mātiṉoṭum teḷḷi aṟintoḻivāy aṉṟiyē aṉpuṭaiyai āyiṉ ceṟintoḻivāy ētēṉuñ cey. Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār 51.*

"If the thoughts in you [categorized] as internal or external are destroyed, the generous Lord will appear in you with Pārvatī and grace you. You follow either the path of love or the path of knowledge. Do either of the two!" (My translation).

sakamārkam is highlighted while not condemning the other path.[102] The inherent contradiction between verses 50 and 51 is puzzling.

Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār introduces two specific ways available in the worship of Śiva (*Civa-taṉmam*). He can be worshipped either in the "soft-way" (*melviṉai*) or in the "hard-way" (*valviṉai*).[103] The aspirant has to choose which will be suitable for him to get rid of *karumam* (*pavakaṉmam nīṅkum paṭi*), and allow him to follow the righteous path (*civataṉmum*). The "soft-way" or *melviṉai* refers to docile and passive ways of worshipping. These include worshipping with flowers (*arccittaṟku*) and making offerings into fire (*tīttil*) All such laudable acts (*nalviṉaiyām*) are easy "for us to carry out" (*namakkum eḷi tāṉavaṟṟai*).[104] *Valviṉai* refers to a harsh or "violent-way" of showing one's love for Śiva. The aspirants involved in this path act in such a way that they consider their actions to be those of Śiva. There is an oblique attempt by the author to assuage the horror of such acts by suggesting that they are acts of Śiva, and the aspirants are not to be blamed or condemned for them (*valviṉaiyē eṉṟatunām maṟṟu*).[105] He further

---

[102] kallil kamaril katirvāḷil cāṇaiyiṉil vallup palakaiyiṉil vātaṉaiyaic - collum akamārkkattāl avarkaḷ māṟṟiṉarkāṇ aiyā cakamārkkat tāl aṉṟē tāṉ. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 50. *"*

"Dictated by their intellect, they changed their karmic path as exhibited in the stone, in the cleft in the paddy field, in the shining dagger, in the whetstone and on the gambling board. Sir! They were transformed because of their devotion and not because of their yogic practices." (My translation).

[103] *melviṉaiyē eṉṉa viyaṉulakil ārṟariya valviṉaiyē eṉṉa varum iraṇṭum - collil civataṉmum ām avaṟṟiṟ ceṉṟatilē celvāy pavakaṉmam nīṅkum paṭi. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 16.*

"It is known that in this vast world there are two paths for salvation worthy of seeking and learning—"the soft-way" and "the hard-way." To rid yourself of the *karumam* [you are born with] follow [and perform] the divinely righteous [acts]." (My translation).

[104] *ātiyai arccittaṟku aṅkamum aṅkaṅkē tīttil tiṟampalavum ceyvaṉavum - vētiyaṉē nalviṉaiyām eṉṟē namakkum eḷi tāṉavaṟṟai melviṉaiyē eṉṟatunām vēṟu. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 17.*

*"*O! Brahmin! All virtuous acts such as worshipping Śiva, offering objects [such as sacred water and flowers] and making offerings into the sacred fire in several ways are easy for us to carry out and are known as the "soft-way." (My translation). It is worth noting that the student is being addressed respectfully as *vētiyaṉ*, one who has studied the Vedas, who is a Brahmin. The teacher also exhibits his kind disposition and humility in saying "for us to carry out" (*namakkum*). In an inclusive way, he considers himself to be still in the path of aspiration.

[105] *varaṅkaḷ tarumceyya vayiravarkkut taṅkaḷ karaṅkaḷiṉāl aṉṟukaṟi yākka - iraṅkātē kolviṉaiyē ceyyum koṭuviṉaiyē āṉavaṟṟai valviṉaiyē eṉṟatunām maṟṟu. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 18.* "He [Ciruttoṇṭar] killed [his son] with his [bare] hands and cooked for Civaṉ, who benefits us with

suggests that the devotees subjected to such violent tests of their fidelity by Śiva did not consider their acts sinful or blameworthy and therefore should not be blamed for them (*pātakam eṉṟum paḻiyeṉṟum pārātē*). They are blessed instead, for their display of devotion (*paricaḷittār*).[106] He even alludes to the story of Kaṇṇappar, the Nāyaṉār, who resorted to *valviṉai* to prove his fidelity and undaunted faith in Śiva, and he was aptly rewarded.[107]

However, the important point is how Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār cleverly sows the seeds of philosophy in what is a collection of devotional treatises. It appears that he saw the opportunity to combine the philosophical work of the *Tiruvuntiyār* and descriptions of the hagiographic miracles[108] described as well as the beginnings of theological ideas from *Periya Purāṇam*, and fuse them together.

My MA thesis demonstrates that Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār was motivated to offer a new path of "inquiry" by way of knowledge but, at the same time, was astute enough to piggyback on the existing treatises of the *bhakti* canon. He was particular not to offer any criticism of the Nāyaṉmār and their enormous contribution, but tried to mold the *bhakti* tradition into the nascent philosophical tradition initiated by his teacher.

In addition, he links and develops the philosophical and the nascent theological elements found in the *Tiruvuntiyār,* and adds the hagiographic accounts of the miracles attributed to the Nāyaṉmār, thus establishing a bridge or

---

boons. We define [such] merciless and murderous deeds as the hard-way." (My translation)

[106] pātakam eṉṟum paḻiyeṉṟum pārātē tātaiyai vētiyaṉait tāḻiraṇṭum - cētippak *kaṇṭuīcar tāmām paricaḷittār kaṇṭāyē taṇṭīcar tañceyalāl tāṉ. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 19*. "Without considering it a grievous sin or blameworthy, Caṇṭīcar cut off both legs of his Brahmin father when tested [by Śiva]. Know that Caṇṭīcar by his own efforts caused Śaiva to grace him with his appearance." (My translation).

[107] *kaṇṇappaṉ oppatōr aṉpiṉmai eṉṟamaiyāl kaṇṇappaṉ oppatōr aṉpataṉaik - kaṇṇappar tāmaṟital kāḷatti yār aṟital allatumaṟṟa yāmaṟiyum aṉpaṉṟu atu. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 52.* "There is no love comparable to that of Kaṇṇappaṉ. The supreme love comparable to that of Kaṇṇappaṉ is known only to Kaṇṇappar and to the dweller of Kāḷatti [Śiva] alone. No one else can know that [immense] love." (My translation).

[108] It is interesting to note that *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* uses only code words to refer to the "miracles" and it does not refer to the poetic hymns of the Nāyaṉmār at all. Was it deliberate? It is difficult for us to derive any conclusion. The strong and perhaps only link between the *Periya Purāṇam* and *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* seems to be the "miracles" cited in the *Periya Purāṇam*.

continuity between the *bhakti* thrust of the Tamil Śaiva faith as documented in the *Tirumuṟai* literature, and the birth of its philosophical or theological direction.

The recurring theme of humility found in Tamil devotional literature is present in the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār*. Uyyavanta Tēvanāyaṉār expresses in all humility that he did not inherit any of the greatness from his superb teacher and likens himself to a parasitic creeper around a tree.[109] Besides briefly explaining the conception of Śiva and the conception of the soul or the self, the author focuses on the conception of *bhakti* or devotion. The devotee's self-surrender to Śiva and how the merger takes place is expressed very poetically as a phenomenon experienced and enjoyed by many devotees. Because Śiva makes the devotee his own (*eṉṉaiyumtaṉ āḷākak koḷḷutāl*), the devotee understands himself (*eṉṉai aṟiyappeṟṟēṉ*) and feels privileged to join the company of devotees (*aṟinta aṉparukkē āḷāyc ceṟiyappeṟṟēṉ kuḻuvil* ceṉṟu).[110]

Continuing on the theme of the *Tiruvuntiyār* about how Śiva, out of his grace, appears as a spiritual preceptor and bestows his nature on the author (*apparicē vantu aḷippar*),[111] the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* questions that if that embodiment had not taken place, how could the scriptures have come into existence? Alternatively, how could anybody know Śiva's nature?[112] He concludes by wondering how he could ever express his gratitude to Śiva (*ētu coli vāḻttuvēṉ*

---

[109] *marap pullūri tol ulakil ammaramāy īṉṟiṭumō Tiruvuntiyār 92*. "The tree provides fruits to all humanity, and yet the creeper around the tree cannot emulate this in spite of its proximity to the tree." (My translation).

[110] *eṉṉai uṭaiyavaṉ vantu eṉṉuṭaṉāy eṉṉaḷavil*
eṉṉaiyumtaṉ āḷākak koḷḷutāl-- eṉṉai
aṟiyappeṟṟēṉ aṟinta aṉparukkē āḷāyc
ceṟiyappeṟṟēṉ kuḻuvil ceṉṟu. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 99.

[111] *ammaiyapparē ulakukku ammaiyappar eṉṟu aṟika*
ammaiyappar apparicē vantu aḷippar--ammaiyappar
ellā ulakukkum appuṟattār ippuṟattum
allāpōl niṟpar avar. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 1.

[112] *ākamaṅkaḷ eṅkē aṟucamayam tāṉeṅkē*
yōkaṅkaḷ eṅkē uṇarvu eṅkē--pākattu
aruḷ vaṭivum tāṉumāy āṇṭilaṉēl antap
peruvaṭivai yār aṟivār pēcu. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 5.

yāṉ), who has blessed him with everything (*ellām tantavaṉai*).[113]

The third text of the philosophical canon, the *Civañāṉapōtam,* is especially important for understanding the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*. It was written by Meykaṇṭār in the thirteenth century.[114] Of the four preceptors of the Śaiva Siddhānta school,[115] Meykaṇṭatēvar was of the Veḷḷāḷa caste, whereas the other three were of the Brahmin caste.[116]

The *Civañāṉapōtam* is a pithy work of only twelve aphorisms but is considered the most important book of the canon.[117] Fittingly, the philosophical canon was later named after Meykaṇṭār. It contains the first systematic exposition of the philosophy of Śaiva Siddhānta. All subsequent books of the canon comment on and elaborate the ideas of Meykaṇṭār. For instance, one of his third generation students, Umāpati, pays him tribute as "the one who could identify the untruth (*poykāṭṭi*), make its removal possible (*poyyakaṟṟi*), and then proceed to point at the true or the real nature [of things] (*meykāṭṭum meykaṇṭāy viṇṇappam*)".[118]

The text is extant in both Sanskrit and Tamil with several commentaries in

---

[113] *cintaiyilum entaṉ cirattiṉilum cērum vaṇṇam*
vantavaṉai maṇṇiṭainām vārāmal--tantavaṉai
mātiṉuṭaṉ ettiṟamum vāḻntirukka eṉpatalāl
ētucoli vāḻttuvēṉ yāṉ. Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār 100.

[114] "The *Śivañāṉapōtam* is the basic and most important text of the philosophy of Tamil Śaivism, composed by Meykaṇṭa Tēvar about A.D. 1221 (year 1143 of Cālivāhana cahāptam)." […] "His [Meykaṇṭa Tēvar's] original name was Svētaraṉam; he was a disciple of Parañjōti Muṉivar, who gave his disciple the new name, Meykaṇṭar (*sic*) ('he who has seen the truth')." DHAVAMONY 1971:200.

[115] Meykaṇṭatēvar, Aruṇanti, Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar, and Umāpati.

[116] "Thus it seems clear that the highest ranks in Shaiva Siddhānta are at least theoretically open to Shūdra men. And, in fact, the existence of Shūdra lineages seems to indicate that someone or some people belonging to a higher-ranking varṇa—and in Tamil Nadu that can only mean Brahmans—not only initiated Shūdras but also authorized some of them to become preceptors." See ISHIMATSU 1999:574-576.

Pillai provides details of Meykaṇṭatēvar's life, beginning with his early childhood, his initiation, and all his accomplishments. See PILLAI 1984:xi-xix.

[117] Iḷaṅkumaraṉ has provided one of the best Tamil commentaries I have come across, written in lucid style, and with a great flair. See IḶAṄKUMARAṈ 1990.

[118] *poykāṭṭip poyyakaṟṟip pōtāṉantap poruḷām*
meykāṭṭum meykaṇṭāy viṇṇappam poykāṭṭāp
meyya tiru veṇṇai vittakā cuttaviṉā aiyā nīṭāṉ kēṭṭaruḷ. Uṇmai viḷakkam 1.

both languages. There is a controversy among scholars in determining if the *Civañāṉapōtam* was originally written in Sanskrit and was later translated into Tamil or vice-versa.[119] There are strong opinions on both sides of the controversy. Suffice to mention that there are two versions of the *Civañāṉapōtam*; one in Sanskrit and the other in Tamil, and my focus will be on the Tamil version.[120] It is beyond the scope of my thesis to compare the two.

The twelve *sūtra*s of the *Civañāṉapōtam* are divided into four parts. The first three *sūtra*s assert the existence of the three verities; the next three define and explain their nature and inter-relations; the next three deals with the means for the attainment of release or *mutti;* and the last is devoted to the nature of *mutti*.[121]

---

[119] "Are these twelve aphorisms translated from the original Sanskrit into Tamil 'for the benefit of the vast multitudes of the non-Sanskritic knowing,' as a tradition with a surprising unanimity averred until recently, or is this a case of the rare instance of feed-back into Sanskrit from a non-Sanskritic source, as is suspected by one section of contemporary scholars?" SIVARAMAN 1983:55.

Siddalingaiah provides compelling arguments vouching for the original Tamil version. His four reasons are, "(1) Meykaṇḍār does not mention this anywhere; it is a translation. (2) Nor did the authors of the other Meykaṇḍā Śāstra works who were contemporaneous to Meykaṇḍār or close to his time either as his disciples or the disciples of his disciples. (3) The Sanskrit version of the same, in the 12th *sūtra*, says, 'thus says the Śivajñāna Bodha'. It is questioned whether a portion of a paṭhala (?) in an āgama can have a separate heading like this and whether, therefore, it does not suggest that it is a rendering of the Tamil Śivañāṉa Bōdam. (4) Even before the advent of Meykaṇḍār, there were works like Ñāṉāmirdam, Tirumandiram, etc., which expounded this system, though not logically and fully as Meykaṇḍār did in his work, and the worship of Śiva had been there even before the Christian era and the hymns in Tamil speak of the greatness and Grace of Śiva and indirectly the tenets of this system." (Spelling, lack of italicization, and diacritics as found in the citation are maintained). See SIDDALINGAIAH 1979:95.

[120] Matthews provides translations of both Tamil and Sanskrit versions of the *Civañāṉapōtam* See MATTHEWS 1948.

Dhavamony, in an appendix titled "The twelve Sanskrit *sūtra*s alleged to have originated from the *Raurava Āgama*" provides translations for the Sanskrit version. DHAVAMONY 1971:327-329. His Tamil translation is provided in another appendix. See DHAVAMONY 1971:330-334.

[121] A single phrase description of the twelve verses are: The existence of god; transmigration, which relates god to world and to souls; the existence of souls; souls and their organs; their dependence on god; matter and god are totally different; nature of soul being released; aids to help in release; how souls are cleansed; removing the souls in fetters; union with god; how released souls worship god. See Appendix 1 for a brief summary of the twelve aphorisms. See also SCHOMERUS 2000:19-24.

Meykaṇṭatēvar outlines what a realized soul should do to attain the final release from the body (*paramutti*). Having washed away the impurities (*ammalṅ kaḻīi*) that prevent the soul from reaching the lotus-like feet (*cemmalar nōṉtāḷ cēral oṭṭā*), and having associated with other realized souls who are constantly mindful of Śiva's love (*aṉparōṭu marīi*), the soul will get rid of its delusion (*māl aṟa nēyam*) and join those who abound in devotion to Śiva and visit his shrines (*ālayam tāṉum araṉ eṉat toḻumē*).[122] Appendix 1 of this thesis provides a capsule summary of the twelve aphorisms.[123]

[122] *cemmalar nōṉtāḷ cēral oṭṭā*
ammalaṅ kaḻīi aṉparoṭu marīi
mālaṟa nēyam malintavar vēṭamum
ālayam tāṉum araṉ eṉat toḻumē. Civañāṉapōtam 12.
[123] See page 346 for a summary of the aphorisms.

1.4 THE *CIVAÑĀṆA CITTIYĀR* : AUTHORSHIP

According to tradition, Aruṇanti is the author of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* and he lived in the mid-thirteenth century CE.[124] There is no internal reference to the author's name in the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, but we can presume it is Aruṇanti because of an internal reference in the fifth verse of the *Civappirakācam* by Umāpati

---

[124] This is as good a place as any to discuss a general problem in dating the authors and their treatises in Tamil philosophical literature. Several scholars have identified this problem. Aruṇanti's treatise is no exception. For example, Goodall states: "Precise dates are commonly given for each of these fourteen 'foundational' treatises [the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*]. All are placed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries except the first two, the *Tiruvuntiyār* and the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār*, which are assigned to 1147 and 1177 AD respectively. One work among the fourteen, the *Caṅkaṟpanirākaraṇam* records the occasion and the date of its composition: 1313 AD. I have not been able to discover on what authority the dates have been assigned to the other thirteen works. Nor am I aware of these dates being investigated in recent secondary literature. Prentiss (…), among others, refers for her dates to Dhavamony 1971 [*Love of God according to the Śaiva Siddhānta: A Study in the Mysticism and Theology of Śaivism*], a much cited work often given the epithet 'authoritative'. Dhavamony in turn (…) refers to Irācamāṇikkaṉār (…) for the date of the *Tiruvuntiyār* (for the other twelve unsubstantiated dates he refers to no authority). Nevertheless, Irācamāṇikkaṉār (…) appears not to give any justification for this date. The dates of the *Meykaṇṭacāttiraṅkaḷ* appear already (without evidence being adduced) in the preface (…) of the Madras edition of 1897. We should note that S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri (…), who appears to have been rigorous in his attempts to date the various authors he studied relative to each other, describes 1313 AD, the date given by Umāpati in the beginning of *Caṅkaṟpanirākaraṇam*, as 'the only date definitely known in the history of Tamil Śaivism.'" See GOODALL 2004:xxxii.

Umāpati Civācāriyār in his *Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam* gives the year in which his work was written, that is Saka 1235 corresponding to 1313 CE. This is a valuable clue in fixing the dates of the other books in the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*.

ēḻ añcu iruṉūṟu eṭutta āyiram (seven times five, [and] two-hundred, [and] thousand)

vāḻum nal cakaṉam [Saka] maruvā niṟpa. Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam 2 (lines 26-27). (My translation).

Based on the same point of reference as Goodall gives, Gangadaran, without providing any sources, estimates the dates of several Śaiva teachers. "The date of Umāpati Śivam's *Sankaṟpa Nirākaraṇam* is mentioned 1313 [CE]. So Umāpati must have lived between 1280-1330 A.D., Maṟaiñāṉa Sambandar 1175-1300 A.D., Aruḷnandi Śivam 1080-1200 A.D., Meykaṇḍār 1125-1175? A.D., Manavācagam Kaḍandār 1100-1200? A.D." See GANGADARAN 1981:128.

I would argue as follows to arrive at the date of Aruṇanti. If we start from the fixed point as year 1313 CE as the date of Umāpati Civācāriyār's *Caṅkaṟpanirākaraṇam*, we could subtract thirty years and peg the date of his teacher Maṟaiñāṉa Sambandar to be late thirteenth century; we could subtract another thirty years for his teacher and arrive at mid-thirteenth century for Aruṇanti's time.

Civācāriyār[125] where he lists the names of teachers in his lineage. Although Aruṇanti does not mention his own name, he does refer to his teacher's name as Meykaṇṭatēvar, in the tenth verse of the *Parapakkam* and also in the third verse of the *Cupakkam*, the two parts of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār.* Meykaṇṭatēvar is the same name preceding Aruṇanti in Umāpati's list of teachers. These internal references attest the lineage. There are also many hagiographic traditions about Aruṇanti to which scholars refer usually without precise identification.[126]

As stated above, unfortunately, the text of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* does not have any internal reference to the author's name. Umāpati Civācāriyār also refers to him only by that name. None of the secondary sources I consulted provides any additional information other than the name Cakalākama Paṇṭitar.[127] A secondary

---

[125] See footnotes 135 and136.

[126] For instance, several scholars in the secondary sources of my research, state that according to tradition, Aruṇanti known as Cakalākama Paṇṭitar, had the honorific name "Aruṇanti" bestowed on him by Meykaṇṭatēvar. There is an interesting episode (with several differing versions) of how Cakalākama Paṇṭitar got his name "Aruṇanti" that eventually led to his composition of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* . Paṇṭitar had several students under his tutelage learning all Āgamic principles and their significance. Once he travelled with his students to Tiruveṇṇainallūr, as part of his pilgrimage to several temples. While camped at this place, many of his students started deserting Paṇṭitar, and went to the abode of Meykaṇṭatēvar, because they were attracted by his inspiring elucidation of the principles of the Śaiva faith. Paṇṭitar was infuriated at losing his disciples, and he went to meet Meykaṇṭatēvar face-to-face with the idea of challenging and defeating him in a verbal debate, and thus establish his superiority. Paṇṭitar wanted to win his students back, besides feeling insulted that Meykaṇṭatēvar did not visit him to pay his obeisance. His self-aggrandizement was evident. When he went to Meykaṇṭatēvar's abode to confront him, Meykaṇṭatēvar was in the process of teaching the concept of *āṇavamalam* and the idea behind this defilement. Paṇṭitar asked Meykaṇṭatēvar to indicate the form of *āṇavam*. In reply, Meykaṇṭatēvar pointed his finger at Paṇṭitar himself as an embodied representation of this defilement. This reply opened the eyes of Paṇṭitar to his ignorant condition and the need to learn first before he could teach others. When the "eye of grace" (*aruḷ nōkku, aruḷ pārvai*) of Meykaṇṭatēvar fell upon him, Paṇṭitar's pride and ignorance dwindled away and he felt that he had been vanquished. He dropped to his knees in reverence, and begged Meykaṇṭatēvar to take him as his student. Meykaṇṭatēvar graciously accepted him as his principal student and conferred the name "Aruṇanti" on him. He became such an adept student that Meykaṇṭatēvar asked him to write a commentary on the *Civañāṉapōtam*. Thus the genesis of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*. The names *Parapakkam* and *Cupakkam* for the two parts of his treatise are not stated by Aruṇanti. It appears that the followers of the school appended the appellations.

[127] For example, see DEVASENAPATHI 1981:4; PIḶḶAI 1972:21. The literal meaning of his name is "Scholar (*paṇṭitar*) of all Āgamas (*cakala ākama*)" and it is based presumably on his extensive

source provides a contradiction to Aruṇanti's honorific name.[128] Certain scholars refer to him as Aruḷnanti, instead of Aruṇanti.[129]

In an invocatory verse Aruṇanti says "Śiva first gave the knowledge to Nanti, who imparted it to Caṉatkumāraṉ. Knowledge thus propagated in succession, reached my teacher [Meykaṇṭatēvar] who documented it in his book of wisdom [*Civañāṉapōtam*]. In writing the commentary on this faultless treatise I name it [the] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*." [130] (My translation). Whereas Aruṇanti closely follows Meykaṇṭatēvar's *Civañāṉapōtam* to explain the basic doctrines of Śaiva Siddhānta, in the *Cupakkam*, his treatment of the "alien schools" in the *Parapakkam* needs some explanation. Aruṇanti, using the typical *Pūrvapakṣin* technique,[131] systematically argues against fourteen different schools. The method of addressing the doctrines of the alien schools individually and dismantling them had been done before. Devasenapathi, quoting Maṟaiñāṉa Teśikar, suggests that Aruṇanti followed the method employed in earlier

---

knowledge of the Āgamas. According to Mu. Tiruviḷaṅkam, Aruṇanti was well versed in both Tamil and Sanskrit, as was the customary education for most boys from Brahmin families. He not only learned all the twenty-eight *Śaivāgamas* to perfection, but he also followed a strict lifestyle in accordance with his pedagogy. He also took upon himself to travel frequently to spread his knowledge and acquire new students in the process. See THIRUVILANGAM 2007:xvi-xvii.. Thiruvilangam provides no primary sources for this information, nor does V.A. Devasenapathy, who claims "…he [Paṇṭitar] went about place to place, visiting Cidambaram, Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, Kāsi, Nepal and other centres and established Śaivism by overcoming his adversaries in philosophical contests." See DEVASENAPATHI 1966:3.

Ciṅkāravēlu Mutaliyār states that Aruṇanti's name and place of birth to be Cakalākama Paṇṭitar of *Āticaiva* community of Tiruttuṟaiyūr. MUTALIAR 1910:4.

[128] Kamil Zvelebil also states, "According to some views, Aruṇanti was his pseudonym, his personal name being Catācivāccāriyar" (Zvelebil does not offer any source). "There are many legends about him [Aruṇanti], and according to one commentator, he was the family priest of Meykaṇṭār's father." See ZVELEBIL 1995:74.

[129] See GOODALL 2004:cxix. See DEVASENAPATHI 1966:3.

[130] *"muṉṉāḷ iṟaivaṉ aruḷ nantitaṉakku iyampa nanti*
kōtil aruṭ caṉaṟkumā rarkkuk kūṟak
*kuvalayattiṉ avvaḷi**em kurunātaṉ** koṇṭu*
tītuakala emakkuaḷitta ñāṉa nūlait
*tērntu uraippaṉ **civañāṉa citti** eṉṟē." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 10.*

[131] See footnote 181 for an explanation of term "*Pūrvapakṣin.*"

compendiums.[132]

There is enough evidence from the verse cited above (*Parapakkam 10*) that the author was a disciple of Meykaṇṭatēvar as Aruṇanti states, “the book of wisdom [*Civañāṉapōtam*] offered to me (*emakkuaḷitta ñāṉa nūl*) by my teacher [Meykaṇṭatēvar] (*em kurunātaṉ*)”. In addition, in verse 6 of the *Parapakkam*, Aruṇanti declares that his teacher Meykaṇṭatēvar appeared on earth to establish righteousness (*ñāṉam parin toḻuka*). He is the undisputed paterfamilias of Śaiva philosophy (*caiva nātaṉ*), and let him always be praised [worshipped] (*eppōtum pōṟṟal ceyvām*).[133]

Additional internal evidence is also available to us in Umāpati’s *Civappirakācam* regarding the lineage (Meykaṇṭatēvar → Aruṇanti Civācāriyār → Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar → Umāpati Civācāriyār)[134]; the lineage is

---

[132] Devasenapathy makes an interesting observation in tracing the genre of the *Parapakkam*. “Maṟaiñāṉa Deśikar, one of the commentators on the Siddhiyār says that Aruḷnandi [Aruṇanti] based his parapakkam on the following works: (1) Śaṅkarācārya's (?) *Sarva Darśana Saṁgraha* [*Sarvadarśana Siddhānta saṁgraha*] (2) *Sarvamatopanyāsa* (3) Rāmānādācārya's *Paramatanirākaraṇa* (4) Sarvānma Śambhu's *Siddhānta Dīpikā* (5) Aghoraśivācārya's *Siddhāntārtha Samuccaya*." (My italicization of all titles).

[133] *“paṇṭaimaṟai vaṇṭāṟṟap pacuntēṉ*
ñāṉam parin toḻuka*c civakantam parantu nāṟak,*
kaṇṭairu tayakamala mukaikaḷ ellām
kaṇṭiṟappak kāciṉimēl vantaaruṭ katirōṉ,
viṇṭamalarp poḻilpuṭaicūḻ veṇṇey
mēvu meykaṇṭa tēvaṉmiku caiva nātaṉ,
puṇṭarika malar tāḷac cirattē vāḻum poṟpātam
eppōtum pōṟṟal ceyvām*.” Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 6.*

[134] There are two Śaivites with the same name, Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar. The first one (late 13th to early 14th century) was the student of Aruṇanti, and it appears the only writing by him was the *Caṭamaṇikkōvai*. There was another Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar who lived in the 16th century, who was not in the lineage of Aruṇanti, and he was a prolific writer. One of his famous compositions was the *Civatarumōttaram*, 1200 verses in 12 sections, based on the *Śaivāgama*s dealing with cosmology, theology, temples, and their constitution. He also wrote the *Caivacamayaneṟi*, which detailed the relationship between the teacher and his disciples, daily religious observances, etc. To add to the confusion, there was also a Maṟaiñāṉa Campanta Tēcikar (circa 1525/1550), a student of Aruṇanti's student Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar. See ZVELEBIL 1995:418-419.

However, J.N. Farquhar mistakenly attributes the authorship of the *Caivacamayaneṟi* to the Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar who was the student of Aruṇanti. " Aruḷnandi's [Aruṇanti’s] disciple was Marai-jñāna-sambandha, a Śūdra and the author of the *Śaiva-samaya-neṟi*." See FARQUHAR 1967:257.

documented by Umāpati when he pays tribute to the originator of his lineage (*cantāṉa paramparai*) in the *Civappirakācam*. In the next verse, he offers his obeisance to Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar, his immediate teacher by offering his head for placing his teacher's revered feet (*malaraṭikaḷ*).[135] Right at the beginning, Umāpati declares that his work, the *Civappirakācam* of one hundred *sūtra*s (*viruttam nūṟum ācil civap pirakācam ākum aṉṟē*), is better suited for Śaiva initiates;[136] he claims that it is much easier to understand than the terse *Civañāṉapōtam* of the revered teacher [Meykaṇṭatēvar] (*terittakuru mutalvar uyar civañāṉa pōtam ceppiṉar piṉpu*); at the same time, it is not as voluminous as the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, which is a commentary on the *Civañāṉapōtam* by Meykaṇṭatēvar's student (*avar putalvar civañāṉa citti virittiṉar*).[137] Umāpati declares his proud lineage by paying tribute to his predecessors (Nantikēcuraṉ, Caṉatkumāraṉ, Parañcōti Māmuṉi, Meykaṇṭatēvar, Aruṇanti, and his teacher Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar).[138]

In his invocatory verses of the *Cupakkam*, Aruṇanti mentions Meykaṇṭatēvar's name (*meykaṇṭāṉ nūl*) and declares that the *Civañāṉapōtam* is the best of all reliable books wherein one finds the essence of all the basic tenets of the Śaiva philosophy (*caivat tiṟattiṉait terikkal uṟṟām*).[139] However, in his concluding verse of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār,* in verse 328 of the *Cupakkam*, Aruṇanti does not offer obeisance to his teacher by name as is customary but highlights the general

---

[135] *"cīrnilavu maṟaiñāṉa campantaṉ entai*
tiruvaḷarum malaraṭikaḷ ceṉṉi vaippām." Civappirakācam 6.

[136] "Among the Siddhānta Sastras, [the] *Śivaprakāsam* is the earliest book that contains the full expression 'Śaiva Siddhānta'. Umāpati not only first used the expression, but also called it as 'the essence of Vedānta." See GANGADARAN 1992:8.

[137] *Civappirakācam 11.*

[138] ***tēvarpirāṉ*** *vaḷarkayilak kāval pūṇṭa* ***tirunanti*** *avarkaṇattōr celvar pāril*
pāviyacat tiyañāṉa taricaṉikaḷ aṭicēr ***parañcōti*** *māmuṉikaḷ patiyām veṇṇey*
mēviyacīr ***meykaṇṭa*** *tiṟlāṉ māṟā viravupukaḷ* ***aruṇanti*** *viṟalār celvat*
tāvil aruḷ ***maṟaiñāṉa campantar*** *ivaric* ***cantāṉat temaiyāḷum*** *taṉmai yōrē* Civappirakācam 5.
In tracing his lineage, Umāpati mentions the Celestials, Nantikēcuraṉ, Parañcōti Māmuṉi, Meykaṇṭatēvar, Aruṇanti, and his immediate teacher Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar.

[139] *"miṉṉamar poḻilcūḻ veṇṇey mēvivāḻ* ***meykaṇṭāṉ nūl***
ceṉṉiyil koṇṭu ***caivat tiṟattiṉait terikkal uṟṟām****." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Cupakkam 3.*

importance of a teacher in reaching salvation and merging with Śiva.[140]

Further internal evidence is available from another treatise, *Irupā irupatu*[141] of the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*. Aruṇanti composed it as a tribute to his teacher, and it is the fifth book of the canon. It contains twenty verses, ten in *nēricaiveṇpā* style, and ten in *nēricai āciriyappā* style in *antāti* arrangement wherein the *veṇpā* and *akaval* meters alternate. It is a eulogy of Meykaṇṭatēvar in question-and-answer format discussing Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy. In its introductory verse, Aruṇanti sets the stage for attaining absolute enlightenment through a dialogue with Meykaṇṭatēvar (*veṇṇey nallūr meykaṇṭāṉ*). Aruṇanti recognizes his teacher not as human,[142] but as a personification of the "three-eyed and blue-throated one" [Śiva] (*kaṇṇutalum kaṇṭak kaṟaiyum karantu*), and one who removes all the impurities of the souls (*mākkaḷ mala*m *akaṯṯum*).[143]

While defining the word "*Cittāntam,*" Aruṇanti declares that there are two [sacred] treatises (*iraṇṭē nūlkaḷ*), the Vedas and the Śaivāgamas (*vētānūl*

---

[140] "*aruḷ kuruvai vaḷipaṭavē...civamē ākkum*" *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Cupakkam 328.*

[141] See Appendix 2 for details.

[142] A sidebar comment about the caste issue in the Śaiva lineage. According to tradition, Aruṇanti did not pay any heed to the chiding that he was a Brahmin and Meykaṇṭatēvar was a Śūdra (a Veḷḷāla, at least his foster parents were so), and Aruṇanti's subservience was demeaning and degrading the status of his caste. Living in a society with strong embedded caste distinctions, not only did Aruṇanti become a student of Meykaṇṭatēvar, a Śūdra, but his own principal student Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar was also a Śūdra. Similarly, Umāpati Civācāriyār, who was a Vaiṣṇavite Brahmin, prior to becoming a Śaivite Brahmin, became a student of the non-Brahmin Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar, a student of Aruṇanti. Could one say erudition and lofty ideals always trump petty caste distinctions? This ideal could be successfully argued in the case of the lineage of Śaiva Siddhānta, since there are plenty of examples littered across the hagiographic accounts in the *Periya Purāṇam* and generally in the lineage of Śaiva teachers. The ones who broke the tradition did not enjoy a *carte blanche* acceptance, but they successfully fought against the odds.

Pranabananda Jash provides a fascinating list of some important thinkers and contributors to the Śaiva faith. " Appuṭi Aṭikaḷ was a Brahmin; Ciruttoṇṭar, a mahāmāttira Brahmin; Naracimma Muṇaiyaraiyār, a ruling chief (kṣatriya); Kāraikkālammaiyār, a Vaiśya; Tirumūlar, a cowherd; Tirunīlakkaṇṭa nāyaṉār, a potter; Tirunīlakkaṇṭayāḻppā nāyaṉār, a member of the Pānar caste; Ēṉātināta nāyaṉār, a toddy-drawer; Atipatta nāyaṉār, a fisherman; Tirukkuṟippuṭṭoṇṭa nāyaṉār, a washerman; Arivāṭṭāya nāyaṉār, a Veḷḷāla; Kaliya nāyaṉār, an oil-monger etc." See JASH 1974:82. Let us not forget that Appar was a Veḷḷāla, and Caṅkili, Cuntarar's wife was a Veḷḷāla temple dancer.

[143] *Irupā Irupatu 1:1-4.*

caivanūl), and what all other treatises say (*vēṟu uraikkum nūl*) has been drawn from these [two] (*ivaṟṟiṉ virinta nūlkaḷ*). The Vedas are general treatises, and the Śaivāgamas are special treatises. The truths explained in the Vedāntic treatises (*vētāntat tītu ipporuḷ koṇṭu uraikkum nūl*) are not in opposition to what the Śaivāgamas explain (*piṟanūl tikaḻpūrvam civākamaṅkaḷ*); they are the essence of what the [Śaiva] Siddhānta treatises say (*cittāntam ākum*).[144] In the next verse, Aruṇanti states that the Siddhānta [treatises] (*cittāntatē*) declare that when Śiva casts his divine look (*civaṉ taṉ tirukkaṭaikkaṇ cērttic*) [on the spiritually mature souls], they become liberated souls (*cīvaṉmuttar āka*).[145]

---

[144] *"vētanūl caivanūl eṉṟu iraṇṭē nūlkaḷ*
vēṟu uraikkum nūl ivaṟṟiṉ virinta nūlkaḷ
vētāntat tītu ipporuḷ koṇṭu uraikkum nūl caivam piṟanūl
tikaḻpūrvam civākamaṅkaḷ cittāntam ākum." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Cupakkam 267.

[145] *"cittāntatē civaṉ taṉ tirukkaṭaikkaṇ cērttic*
ceṉaṉam oṉṟilē cīvaṉmuttar āka." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Cupakkam 268.

1.5 THE *CIVAÑĀṆA CITTIYĀR*: INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXT

The author of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, Aruṇanti Civācāriyār of Āticaiva ancestry was also called Cakalāmaka Paṇṭitar of Tiruttuṟaiyūr, which, according to some views, was his pseudonym, his personal name being Catācivāccāriyar.[146] He can be dated around the mid-thirteenth century based on the dates recorded in Umāpati's *Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam.*[147] Aruṇanti was one of the forty-nine students of Meykaṇṭatēvar who wrote the *Civañāṉapōtam*.

There is no critical edition of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* in the modern sense of the term. The Institut français de Pondichéry (IFP) in Tamilnadu has some manuscript palm leafs and paper copies in its library.[148] I am using the Tamil edition of the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ* edited by Irattinacapapathy and published by the University of Madras as my primary Tamil source. I have chosen this edition over other Tamil versions available (The Project Madurai version[149]) and the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiram-Patiṉāṉku* published by the South India Śaiva Siddhānta Works Publishing Society because the edition I am using has the official approval of the Department of Śaiva Siddhānta of the University of Madras. In addition, this publication along with the entire text of the other thirteen books of the canon is one of the textbooks used in the academic programs (M.A., M. Phil., and Ph.D.) of the University of Madras. For my translation, however, I will be consulting all three editions.

---

[146] "There are many legends about him (Aruṇanti), and according to one commentator, he was the family priest of Meykaṇṭār's father." See ZVELEBIL 1995:74.

[147] See footnote 124 for a discussion on establishing the dates for the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*.

[148] Email exchanges with Dr. Ganesan of The Institut français de Pondichéry (IFP), Pondichéry, India. The Institute is in the process of making them available online for interested students and scholars.

[149] Project Madurai on the web (www.tamil.net/projectmadurai) is an open and voluntary initiative to collect and publish free electronic editions of ancient Tamil literary classics. The project leaders have contributed to the Tamil scholars interested in researching original texts in Tamil. Electronic versions of printed texts (abbreviated as E-texts) of ancient literary works are important pedagogic and scholarly resources. Stored in easily accessible archives, they permit preservation and wider distribution of ancient literary works around the globe through the means of internet. Most of the Śaiva Siddhānta literature in Tamil can be downloaded from the website.

1.6 LITERATURE REVIEW

Works in English: As early as in 1913, J.M. Nallaswami Pillai (1864-1920) produced a loose English translation of both the *Parapakkam* and the *Cupakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*.[150] It was published as a "draft," but was never completed.[151] It is the only complete English translation available for the entire *Civañāṉa Cittiyār,* including both the *Parapakkam* and *Cupakkam*. His contribution to the propagation of Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta is legendary.[152]

Mariasusai Dhavamony, in his title *Love of God According to Śaiva Siddhānta* (1971) has introduced the doctrine of *bhakti*, or divine love as expounded by the principal Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta treatises. The title provides a historical and doctrinal background besides an etymological and exegetical analysis of the corpus of treatises of Śaiva Siddhānta. As the author focuses on the concept of *bhakti*, his analysis of the Tamil philosophical canon in general and the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* in particular are rather peripheral. He has picked verses here and there at random from each of the fourteen works and provided translation. Dhavamony[153] outlines his work in unambiguous terms by saying "The present work is the first attempt to probe into the theology of Tamil Śaivism and its *bhakti* mysticism."[154]

---

[150] PILLAI 1913. Being an unedited "draft," the translation has many inaccuracies. Other scholars have similar assessments and observations. See GOPALAKRISHNAN 1987:23. See also TOKUNAGA 1981:12.

[151] Telephone communication with Professor T. N. Ramachandran, Chennai, India. (November, 2011).

[152] In contrast to some other Tamil intelligentsia of his period, Nallaswami Pillai was not a Tamil nationalist. He was not against any particular caste such as the Brahmins, and he was very much in favor of using Sanskrit references. In fact, he demonstrates his mastery over both languages by liberally quoting from both Tamil and Sanskrit literary and philosophical treatises. Maraimalai Atikal (1875-1950) a contemporary of J.M. Nallaswami Pillai, founded the "Tanittamil" movement (meaning, only or exclusively Tamil), and he abhorred the idea of using Sanskrit loan words in Tamil literature. "It is clear that Maraimalai Atikal had started the Tanittamil Movement because of his unassailable conviction that the pristine Tamil civilization had to be kept intact by writing in a pure-Tamil style. It is also clear that he was against the Brahmins, who thought that Tamil was not so great." See SIVATHAMBY 1978:18.

[153] DHAVAMONY 1971.

[154] DHAVAMONY 1971:3.

He is probably the pioneer among Western scholars, besides Gordon U. Pope (*The Tiruvaçagam or "Sacred Utterances" of the Tamil Poet, Saint, and Sage Māṇikka-vāçagar*), to publish a scholarly work on south Indian Śaivism demonstrating broad learning, extensive reference to primary sources, and an admirable sensitivity in dealing with elements of Indian devotion.

Muneo Tokunaga (1981), as part of his studies in Vaiṣṇavism, has translated those verses (264-301) from the *Parapakkam* that deal with Aruṇanti's attack of the Pāñcarātra school. In his brief article, the author argues that there are many similarities between the Śaiva Siddhānta position and the Viśiṣṭādvaita view, especially in their concepts of liberation and epistemology. The author also attempts, rather unconvincingly, to establish that there is an underlying congruence between Śaiva Siddhānta and Viśiṣṭādvaita in their opposition to the Advaitic position of Śaṅkara. Tokunaga seems appreciative of the fact Aruṇanti did not criticize the doctrines of the Viśiṣṭādvaita, but chose to attack the positions of Vedāntins such as Śaṅkara and Bhāskara. However, the author changes his tune, and exhibits his bias by pointing out that it was patently wrong on the part of Aruṇanti to refuse the supremacy of Viṣṇu. Aruṇanti, obviously extols the omnipotence and supremacy of Śiva, which Tokunaga characterizes as "derogation of Viṣṇu's dignity."[155]

R. Gopalakrishnan compiled a summary of the *Parapakkam* with clear albeit terse commentary (1987). The author has not attempted to critically analyze Aruṇanti's position vis-à-vis the schools attacked by him but has simply echoed Aruṇanti's comments.[156] It is interesting that Gopalakrishnan uses Sanskrit terminology for most of the technical terms, and not Tamil.

H.W. Schomerus originally published the title *Der Śaiva Siddhānta* in German in 1912, and it has been translated into English by Mary Law (2000).[157] The work provides a well-documented account of the theistic Śaiva movement, focusing on

---

[155] TOKUNAGA 1981.
[156] GOPALAKRISHNAN 1987.
[157] See SCHOMERUS 2000.

Tamil Śaivism with extensive English translations of many citations from Tamil Śaiva literature.[158] Besides providing an extensive background, Schomerus raises the problem of whether the original composition of the *Civañāṉapōtam* was in Tamil or Sanskrit, still a point of contention among scholars. Unfortunately, he does not offer any definitive opinion. Moreover, in tracing the history of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, he makes an unsubstantiated reference to Tirumūlar's date.[159] However, the author has taken pains to explore and explain the doctrinal positions of Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, and how they differ from other important contemporary schools such as Advaita and Sāṁkhya. His comprehensive citations from the canonical texts include many verses from the *Cupakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār,* but very few from the *Parapakkam*.

In 2002, Alvapillai Velupillai provided a translation of the section on the Buddhist schools in the Parapakkam of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār.*[160] I have chosen to retranslate it in order to obtain a better understanding of the Śaiva Siddhānta polemic against the Buddhist schools by familiarity with the technical vocabulary and nuance of the Tamil original verses.

In addition to the above scholarship in English, there is scholarship in Tamil that is relevant to the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*. Caṇmukacuntara Mutaliyār (1876), in his introduction to the *Parapakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* mentions three original Tamil commentaries on the *Parapakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, those by Tiruvo̲r̲riyūr Ñāṉappirakācar, his student Tattuvappirakācar, and Vēlappaṇṭāram. The author merely states that the version by Vēlappaṇṭāram differs from the other two and suggests that the author of this version was probably one

---

[158] "Schomerus' volume […] has been a definitive reference book on the Tamil school of Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy; for English speakers, Mary Law's translation will likely replace M. Dhavamony's *Love of God According to Śaiva Siddhānta* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), which has been out of print for many years, as the key book-length study." See PRENTISS 2001:594.

[159] "His [Tirumūlar's] extensive work, the *Tirumantra* (*sic*), which may even go back to the first century, provides several basic thoughts of Śaiva Siddhānta and a sophisticated theology. Until even older Siddhāntin writings in Tamil are discovered we must assume that it was Tirumūlar who made the philosophy and world view of the Āgamas accessible to the people of Tamil-speaking southern India." See SCHOMERUS 2000:25.

[160] VELUPPILLAI 2002.

Maṟaiñāṉa Tēcikar. Another version by one Poṉṉampalam Mutaliyār is identical to the one authored by Tiruvoṟṟiyūr Ñāṉappirakācar. However, he does not date them. Without elaborating any further, he mentions that there are differences among them.[161]

There are a few other works worthy of mention. Ciṅkāravēlu Mutaliyār (1910) has re-published Caṇmukacuntara Mutaliyār's edition (1876), with minor omissions.[162] Mīṉāṭcicuntaram Piḷḷai (1955), in his commentary on the *Parapakkam* lists four original commentaries on the *Parapakkam*.[163] Irāmanāta Piḷḷai (1975) in his commentary does not address the issue of the past scholarship, nor does he focus on any other topic. The Tamil title has a gloss on the *Parapakkam* and no prefatory matter. However, the edition has a useful alphabetical index for all the verses in the *Parapakkam*.[164] Irattiṉacapāpati (1988) as the editor of the publication by the University of Madras does not provide any information on the source for his compilation.[165]

Finally, there is also general scholarship on Tamil *bhakti* and Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta that is relevant to this study aside from the work of Dhavamony already mentioned.

The contribution by V. A. Devasenapathy[166] in opening up the scholarship of Śaiva Siddhānta in English has to be recognized. In his book, he outlines the leading concepts of the school in a clear and organized manner. After a rigorous explanation of the important categories, he expounds the theoretical doctrines.

---

[161] See MUTALIYĀR 1876:5-6.

[162] MUTALIAR 1910.

[163] He refers to (1) A palm-leaf manuscript by Ampalavāṇa Muṉivar (circa 1842) of the Tiruvāṭuturai Ātīṉam in very good condition, which also has a commentary on the *Cupakkam* by Maṟaiñāṉa Tēcikar; (2) a hand-written paper MS by Cuntaraliṅkattampirāṉ Cuvāmikaḷ (1892) of the Tiruvāṭuturai Ātīṉam; (3) a printed edition of *Meykaṇṭacāttiraṅkaḷ* by Kāñci-Nākaliṅka Mutaliyār (1897) contains commentaries on both *Parapakkam* and *Cupakkam*. This edition has several corrections carried out by Irāmacāmippiḷḷai and Ñāṉacampantappiḷḷai of the Tiruvāṭuturai Ātīṉam, and (4) Printed commentary by Ciṅkāravēlu Mutaliyār (1910), which has many typographical errors. See PIḶḶAI 1955:33-34.

[164] PIḶḶAI 1975.

[165] IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988.

[166] DEVASENAPATHI 1966.

Then he turns to the practical teachings relating to the means to release and the conception of release itself.[167] He has taken pains to highlight the doctrinal differences among the commentaries on the canonical texts.

Krishna Sivaraman,[168] in his voluminous work, presents an analytical interpretation of the major presuppositions of Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy. Dismissing all other theories of creation, the author turns to the aid of *satkāryavāda*,[169] a theory that maintains the prior existence of the effect in the cause, and the continued existence of the cause in the effect. He analyzes all the categories in detail and highlights the importance of the human quest for salvation. According to him, Śiva Yoga, described in successive stages leading to the total surrender of the self to Śiva, is the ultimate goal of Śaiva Siddhānta. The paths of knowledge (*jñāna mārga*-Sanskrit) and action (*karma mārga*-Sanskrit) overlap so much that the author's attempt to maintain the process of liberation as *jñāna mārga* at certain points and *karma mārga* at other points is rather unclear and even misleading. Sivaraman cites seven commentaries on the *Cupakkam* but does not mention any commentary on the *Parapakkam*.[170]

We also have to acknowledge the immense contribution by Kamil Zvelebil with his monumental works on Tamil literature (*The Smile of Murugan – On Tamil Literature of South India, 1973,* two volumes on Tamil Literature, *Tamil Literature 1974,* and *Tamil Literature 1975,* and the *Lexicon of Tamil Literature,* 1995). He addresses the literature aspect of the Śaiva Siddhānta school with meticulous details for dates.[171]

Indira Viswanathan Peterson's[172] knowledge of both Tamil and Sanskrit

---

[167] DEVASENAPATHI 1963.

[168] SIVARAMAN 1973.

[169] SIVARAMAN 1973:78-81.

[170] (1) Cuvāmi Ñāṉappirākacar, (2) Veḷḷiyampala Tampirāṉ Cuvāmi, (3) Nirampavaḻakkiyār, (4) Maṟaiñāṉa Tēcikar, (5) Civākkirayōkiṉ, (6) Civañāṉa Cuvāmi, (7) Cuppiramaṇiya Tēcikar. See SIVARAMAN 1988:xxiii-xxiv.

[171] ZVELEBIL 1973:23-44. See the chapter on "Problems of Dating, Relative and Absolute Chronology."

[172] PETERSON 1989.

enhances her perspective and analysis of the Śaiva devotional poetry of the poet-saints, the *nāyaṉmār*. In her book *Poems to Śiva,* (1989), she discusses the background of the devotional hymns in the Tēvāram, with a focus on the temple rituals practiced by the devotional communities in honoring the author-saint-singers. Peterson has surveyed the religious history of the role of the poems and has included an analysis of Śaiva theology. The major part of the work is devoted to the English renderings of the hymns. In an article,[173] Peterson analyzes the culmination of the Tamil Śaiva religiosity in the hagiographies of the *Periya Purāṇam* as sacred poetry.

Anne Monius,[174] in two articles, has covered many aspects of Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta. She traces the construction of Śaiva theology in the *Periya Purāṇam* in a very convincing fashion and states that it bridges "the worlds of the canonical poetry and the later philosophical tradition."[175]

Karen Prentiss[176] analyzes *bhakti* in its generic motif in Indian devotional literature before shifting her focus to Tamil Civa *bhakti* in particular. She examines the devotional love in its various aspects, such as the poetic, hagiographic, and philosophical angles. The book includes some well-chosen translations of the devotional hymns of the *nāyaṉmār*.

Ginette Ishimatsu[177] investigates the origins of Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta and suggests that there has been a long history of competition, ambivalence, and accommodation among the competing forces in Tamilnadu. The article focuses on the historical caste differences that existed and the present day establishment of ideas of egalitarianism and Tamil identity.

Dominic Goodall[178] addresses the relationships among South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta school in a review article of Hélène Brunner-Lachaux's

---

[173] PETERSON 1983.
[174] MONIUS 2004.
[175] MONIUS 2004:197.
[176] PRENTISS 1999.
[177] ISHIMATSU 1999.
[178] GOODALL 2000.

richly annotated translation of the *Somaśambhupaddhati*, an influential classic eleventh-century book of Śaiva rituals. Goodall does not directly address any of the books of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta canon under consideration here. The other reference to Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta is in the preface in his critical edition and annotated translation of the *Parākhyatantra*, a pre-tenth century Tantric text.[179] Goodall does not mince words in his critical analysis of the state of research on Śaiva Siddhānta and its treatment in modern secondary literature.

Alastair McGlashan[180] has provided an elegant and erudite translation of the *Periya Purāṇam.* In his English translation, he maintains fidelity to the original Tamil text. His extensive notes at the end of the book are very helpful as they are indexed on verse numbers.

[179] GOODALL 2004.
[180] MCGLASHAN 2006.

1.7 THE *CIVAÑĀṆA CITTIYĀR* IN THE CONTEXT OF DIALECTICS, DEBATES, AND POLEMICS

The *Civañāṉa Cittiyār,* written in verse form in *viruttam* meter, has two parts to it; the *Parapakkam* and the *Cupakkam*. The author uses the word *Parapakkam* (meaning heretical or alien) to identify the doctrines of the other competing schools; accordingly, the *Parapakkam* of three hundred verses, is an exposition and criticism of many rival schools of thought - both those that accept the ultimate validity of the Vedas as well as the ones that do not - from the standpoint of Śaiva Siddhānta. More specifically, the author enunciates and criticizes the doctrines of the fourteen Indian philosophical systems that were known at that time: Cārvāka, Sautrāntika, Yogācāra, Mādhyamika, Vaibhāṣika, Niggaṇṭhavāda, Ājīvika, Kumārila Mīmāṁsā, Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā, Śabda Brahmavāda, Māya-vāda, non-theistic Sāṁkhya, Pariṇāmavāda, and Pāñcarātra.

In the *Parapakkam*, the author begins his discussion of each system or school by putting on the hat of the protagonist (*pūrvapakṣin*), and describes the main tenets of the school, ostensibly as though he belongs to it.[181] He sets the scene

---

[181] "*Pūrvapakṣa* ('the first side') is the technical term for the preliminary position, or prima facie view in a theological or philosophical argument. It usually takes the form of an objection put into the mouth of an opponent (real or imagined)." "*Siddhānta* ('established end') is the technical term for the demonstrated and definitive conclusion to a theological or philosophical argument. It follows the refutation of the *Pūrvapakṣa*." See JOHNSON 2009:251, 297.

According to Junankar, "If we could find a body of philosophers without any initial commitment to any dogma or doctrine who would sit in judgment on what are known as *pūrvapakṣa* and *uttarapakṣa* (i.e., view and counter-view), then it would be possible for us to determine what was demolished and what was constructed by our philosophers.[…] The path of siddhānta is strewn with thorns and the philosophers wish to remove them so that the followers of the system have no difficulty in following the path cleared by the philosophers." This was stated in defense of the dialectics used in Nyāya philosophy. See JUNANKAR 1978:521-522.

The genre of the *Pūrvapakṣin-Siddhāntin* type of dialectic is commonly used in several Indian philosophical treatises. However, there are scholars who criticize this traditional dialectical technique. "In the regularity with which he [the protagonist] carries out this procedure, which sometimes appears rather artificial in view of the fact that the pūrvapaksha in some instances can scarcely have been more than a man of straw, he may be compared with the Western scholastic Thomas Aquinas." See HARRISON 1932:45.

"Generally, in an Indian philosophical work, first, the opponent's view is given [*pūrvapakṣa*]; and

for the impending attack. Then he puts on the hat of the adversarial school termed *Siddhāntin*, namely his own Śaiva Siddhānta, and begins to comment on the basic philosophy of the opposing school. In this manner, the author follows the Indian philosophical tradition of one school claiming superiority over other schools through deconstruction of their philosophical tenets. This is achieved by demonstrating the weakness of the facts and logic of the opponents by presentation of its own basic tenets, in rigorous fashion based on good facts and sound logic. Indian thought purports to be comprehensive, and so it was important for the author of this text to present and critically analyze all of these schools as a prelude to his presentation of Śaiva Siddhānta thought in the second part of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, the *Cupakkam*.

The word *Cupakkam* literally means "one's own side," and it is the Tamil orthographic form of the Sanskrit word *svapakṣa*. The author uses the word *Cupakkam* to indicate the settled conclusion or accomplished end in distinguishing itself from the non-Śaiva schools. The *Cupakkam* of three hundred and twenty-eight verses treats the principles of Śaiva Siddhānta in detail and clarifies any possible lingering doubts that might exist; it closely follows the third book of the canon, the *Civañāṉapōtam*; in fact, it could be called a verse commentary on the *Civañāṉapōtam,* which amplifies the doctrines stated therein. The *Cupakkam* has a very different tone, however, compared to the *Parapakkam* as it extols the greatness of the Śaiva Siddhānta school *vis-à-vis* other Śaiva and non-Śaiva schools with no critical comments.

To understand the author's purpose and style, it is important to place this text in the larger context of dialectics, debates, and polemics in Indian philosophy prior to his time.

During the classical and medieval period in India, as different philosophical schools developed and matured, a natural competition developed wherein all schools vied for their own niche. The ensuing competition attracted many followers, be they from the non-committed milieu, or from other schools. For a

---

then, after this view is rejected, one gives the final view [*siddhānta*]." See GRIMES 1988:281.

particular school to attract new adherents from other schools, it became incumbent on them to use two fronts, one to entice membership by selling the salient points of their own school and the other by commenting on the tenets of the competing schools with valid arguments and establish their superiority. It is worth noting that the genre in debates where it was a winner-take-all was different from dialectical treatises where philosophical problems were discussed with a focus on getting to the truth than defeating another advocate. Sometimes these works simply discredited other schools by pointing out the holes in their arguments and concluded with a summary of the superiority of their own school. There are instances wherein the works degenerated to mere polemics.

The Śaiva Siddhānta school was no exception. The *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* under consideration here uses both fronts to lead the campaign. In this section, I provide definitions for the technical terms that will be applicable, background information about the development of debating techniques and the norms established for conducting philosophical debates, and brief examinations of several antecedent texts that attempt to refute other schools.

The word “dialectic” is a word of Greek origin, signifying “the art of discussion” or “logical controversy.” The *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* in its definition of “dialectic”[182] states that it is a discussion and reasoning by dialogue as a method of intellectual investigation. In addition, “dialectics” represents any systematic reasoning, exposition, or argument, especially in literature that juxtaposes opposing or contradictory ideas, and usually seeks to resolve their conflict. The closest words in Indian Sanskrit philosophical literature to convey the idea of dialectics are *tarkaḥ*, *tarkavidyā*, and *anumānoktiḥ*.[183] Esther Solomon provides explanations to other Sanskrit words in this context, such as, *vāda* (speech),[184] *saṁbhāṣā* (discourse), *kathā* (debate, controversy), and *tarka*

---

[182] *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. s.v. "polemic" (p. 959)*.

[183] *A Dictionary: English and Sanskrit - Monier Williams. s.v. "dialectic" (p. 180)*.

[184] The word *vāda* has numerous meanings such as a speech, a thesis, a proposition, an argument, a doctrine, or a discussion. See *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Monier-Williams. s.v. "vāda" (p. 939)*.

(reasoning, enquiry).[185] According to Winslow, the equivalent Tamil words to describe dialectics are *tarkkacāstiram* or *niyāya-cāstiram*.[186] *The English-Tamil Dictionary (University of Madras)* provides descriptive entries for the same word "dialectics," such as *vātamuṟaippaṭi uṇmaiyai āytal*, *aḷavaiyāyvu*, and *coṟpōr muṟaiyāṉa*.[187] "Debate" is defined in the English dictionary[188] as a contention by words and arguments, or a regulated discussion between two matched sides. In modern parlance, political debates take place in the form of formal discussions of a motion before a deliberative body according to the rules of parliamentary procedure. Solomon provides good examples of actual debates and controversies and their philosophical, religious, and social implications.[189] Karl Potter highlights some of the nuances in carrying out debates in both Hindu and Buddhist contexts.[190] Monier-Williams provides several Sanskrit equivalents to describe "debate" such as *vivādaḥ*, *vādānuvādaḥ*, *vādaprativādaḥ*, *saṁvādaḥ*, *vi-saṁvādaḥ* and many more.[191]

According to Winslow, the equivalent Tamil words are *tarkkam*, *viyājjiyam*, *vivakāram*, and *vivātam*.[192] Another dictionary has several expressions to convey the meaning of debate in Tamil, such as *vātam*, *coṟpōr*, *vāyccaṇṭai*, *vākkuvātam*, *vātāṭṭam*, and many more synonyms.[193]

The *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary's* definition of "polemics" states that it is an aggressive attack on, or refutation of, the opinions or principles of another, the art or practice of disputation, or controversy.[194] Both "polemic" and

---

[185] SOLOMON 1976:1-18.
[186] *Winslow's English-Tamil Dictionary. s.v. "dialectic" (p. 351)*.
[187] *English-Tamil Dictionary. s.v. "dialectic" (p. 295)*.
[188] *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. s.v. "debate" (p. 564)*.
[189] SOLOMON 1978:833-875.
[190] POTTER 1977:203-208.
[191] See *A Dictionary: English and Sanskrit - Monier Williams. s.v. "debate" (p. 158)*.In the Indian context, the vocabulary to identify "debates" and "dialectics" do overlap, and sometimes, are used interchangeably.
[192] *Winslow's English-Tamil Dictionary. s.v. "debate" (p. 314)*.
[193] *English-Tamil Dictionary. s.v. "debate" (p. 277)*.
[194] *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. s.v. "polemic" (p. 959)*.

"polemical" can be used as an adjective. The equivalent Sanskrit words for polemics are *vādānuvādaḥ* (controversy) or *vivādaḥ* (disputation) or *vi-saṁ-vādaḥ* (false assertion).[195] The equivalent Tamil words are *vivātakkalai* which is "art of disputation" or *vivātappayiṟci*, meaning, "exercise in disputation."[196] Winslow provides the words *tarkkam* and *vivātam* to describe polemics.[197]

The Sanskrit words mentioned above for dialectics (*vāda*, *saṁbhāṣā*, *kathā,* and *tarka*) slowly morphed to mean different kinds of debates in the context of the competing Indian schools of philosophy. Some were debates conducted in a candid spirit for the determination of truth; others were meant to overthrow the other party. In certain other cases, there was just a volley of arguments, destructive in character, and intent on ridiculing the opponent. The principles of valid reasoning emerged from such debates. Gradually, logicians tried to distinguish systematically between valid and invalid arguments. As debating techniques developed, Brahmins, Buddhists, and Jains started critically examining each other's logical positions. They sometimes wrote about these in the form of questions and answers.

With the maturation of the science of Indian logic, strict rules were spelled out for conducting debates. Gautama's treatise on logic of circa 150 CE, the *Nyāya-sūtra*, as this collection of tenets is called, deals with five subjects: (1) *pramāṇa*, or the means of right knowledge, (2) *prameya*, or the object of right knowledge, (3) *vāda*, which means a discussion, (4) *avayava*, that is the members of a syllogism, and (5) *anya mata parīkṣā*, which means an examination of contemporaneous philosophical doctrines.[198]

This same text also formulated a theory of debate. A debate or controversy (*kathā*) can be of three kinds: a discussion (*vāda*), a disputation (*jalpa*), or a

---

[195] *A Dictionary: English and Sanskrit - Monier Williams. s.v. "polemic" (p. 604)*.

[196] *English-Tamil Dictionary. s.v. "polemic" (p. 751)*.

[197] *Winslow's English-Tamil Dictionary. s.v. "polemic" (p. 1011)*.

[198] Solomon, in an exhaustive fashion, deals with the subject of debates in an Indian context SOLOMON 1976:101-270.

simple wrangling (*vitaṇḍā*).[199] As pointed out earlier, the word *vāda* has numerous meanings such as a speech, a thesis, a proposition, an argument, a doctrine, or a discussion. Two other technical words often used in the context of debates are quibbling (*chala*) and sophistical refutation (*jāti*).[200] Quibbling has a tricky character, because it is based on evading the point of an argument by niggling about words and is used to disconcert and confuse the opponent in the course of debate. Ernst Prets provides an engaging analysis of the term (*jāti*) to determine if the term can also be considered a devious one.[201]

A discussion (*vāda*) consists in putting forward a proposition (*pakṣa*) and a counter-proposition (*pratipakṣa*) by two parties in which the procedural details—such as refuting by means of proofs (*pramāṇa*s) and by hypothetical reasoning (*tarka*)—are established. Neither of the two means is totally opposed to the main thesis, and both are conducted in accordance with the method of reasoning, already arranged for, and agreed upon. *Vāda* is an ideal debate meant for the discernment of truth and not for faultfinding. Even if there are grounds for censure in the opponent's argument, no time should be wasted in pointing them out to defeat the opponent. Instead, further discussion should be encouraged in seeking the truth.[202]

In disputations (*jalpa*), the procedure is similar but with one difference. *Vāda* is meant for discernment of truth or the real nature of the subject under investigation; it imparts the truth to the other party, as one understands it. In *vāda*, there is no consideration of victory or defeat. However, in *jalpa*, victory is the sole end in view, and so the reasoning is not always as sound as it ought to be. In *vāda*, the parties themselves are quite certain of their view and position, and there is no intention to deceive. Both parties, being free from any arrogance or desire to win the debate, should come to a right understanding after all. In *jalpa* and *vitaṇḍā*, on the other hand, even the learned debater may put forward

---

[199] JUNANKAR 1978:297-305.
[200] SOLOMON 1976:8.
[201] PRETS 2001:545-558.
[202] SOLOMON 1976:102.

reasons and arguments that he knows to be untrue. Even if these do not lead to the correct conclusion or victory, the debater is pleased to avoid defeat by creating a sense of doubt in the minds of all concerned. What the debater aims at is not the resolution of sincere doubt but rather the winning of an argument by any means, fair or foul.

In *jalpa*, the attempt is to smother opposition by vehement criticism and rejoinders with overbearing arrogance in assertion, and in *vitaṇḍā,* the aim is simply to destroy the edifice of the opponent's arguments, even by foul means and methods. Any of these (*jalpa*, *vitaṇḍā*, or *vāda*) or their derivatives as 'argumentative' is a stretch. An argumentative person argues for the sake of arguing; the objective is not seeking (or decimating) truth or knowledge. By nature, the argumentative person disagrees with any point of view with no serious input to the discussion or debate. Fact or fiction is irrelevant.[203]

It is important to note Gautama's diligence in the *Nyāya-sūtra*); he does not stop with providing rules for debates in terms of proper reasoning, debating techniques, what is not allowed, and so on. He also establishes clear rules for declaring defeat. He spells out twenty-two points of defeat (*nigraha sthāna*), making the process transparent and unimpeachable.[204]

---

[203] It is worth examining some of Henry Colebrook's definitions: "…tarka is reduction to absurdity. It is a mode of reasoning, for the investigation of truth, by deduction from wrong premises, to an inadmissible conclusion which is at variance with proof, whether actual perception or demonstrable inference. The conclusion to which the premises would lead is inadmissible, as contrary to what is demonstrated, or as conceding what is disproved. It is not to be confounded with doubt, to which there are two sides; but to this there is but one. […] Disputation (*kathā*) is conference or dialogue of interlocutors maintaining adverse positions, whether contending for victory, or seeking the truth. It comprises three of the categories. One is (*jalpa*) debate of disputants contending for victory; each seeking to establish his own position and overthrow the opponent's. Another is (*vāda*) discourse, or interlocution of persons communing on a topic in pursuit of truth, as preceptor and pupil together with fellow students. The third is (*vitaṇḍā*) cavil, or controversy wherein the disputant seeks to confute his opponent without offering to support a position of his own. […] Fraud (*chhala*), or perversion and misconstruction, is of three sorts: first, verbal misconstruing of what is ambiguous; second, perverting, in a literal sense, what is said in a metaphorical one; third, generalizing what is particular. After all these is (*jāti*) a futile answer, or self-confuting reply." See COLEBROOKE 2001:48-49. (my italicization).

[204] JUNANKAR 1978:330-331.

According to another treatise, the *Caraka Saṁhitā* (circa first century CE), a debate with a fellow-scholar can be carried on (1) in a spirit of cooperation, that is friendly in spirit, or (2) in a spirit of opposition, which will be a hostile debate.[205] Rules are clearly stated, describing the appropriate comportment and language to use. In a debate, the other party (*para*) may be of three kinds—superior (*pravara*), inferior (*pratyavara*) and equal (*sama*). The assembly (*pariṣad*), where a debate takes place, may be of two kinds, namely learned (*jñāna vatī*) or ignorant (*mūḍhā*). Each of these may again be friendly (*suhṛd*), neutral, or indifferent (*udāsīna*), and hostile or committed to one side (*pratiniviṣṭa*). For all such iterations and permutations, specific rules and guidelines are spelled out.

The *Caraka Saṁhitā* provides a lucid classification and a lively picture of debates, assemblies, kinds of debaters, and practical devices for defeating the opponent.[206] It assumes the opponent to be, of course, an inferior or an equal, especially when the assembly is ignorant, and at the same time friendly or indifferent. *Ad hominem* attacks are not allowed. Appropriate demeanor and language are extremely important. These debates are conducted in public with a judge present. The entire debate takes place in "real time," sometimes lasting for days and, at the end, a winner is declared. The consequences of defeat and success are established prior to the commencement of the debate. The decision is fairly handed out, and is based on the convincing arguments of the winner. As stated earlier, the *Nyāyasūtrabhāṣya* lists twenty-two ways of losing an argument.[207] Debating techniques among the competing schools developed into a science, and several other important treatises were written; they are generally classified as works of logic.[208]

---

[205] SOLOMON 1976:12-14.

[206] SOLOMON 1976:71-90.

[207] See POTTER 1977:271-274. Alberto Todeschini also weighs in with an incisive analysis of losing an argument, utilizing the argumentation theory.See TODESCHINI 2010:49-74. For a complete list of the twenty-two varieties of the points of defeat and their explanation, see VIDYABHUSANA 1988 (Reprint):84-90.

[208] Vidyabhusana lists several treatises, dividing them into three periods: (1) the treatises that originated from the orthodox schools (Ancient, 650 BCE to 100 CE), (2) treatises that were

In the Indian tradition, the important difference between verbal debates and polemical writings is that the debates are orally conducted in front of an audience and a judge, whereas the polemical works are written and originate within a philosophical school or philosophical lineage, although they may incorporate the ideas or even the structure of previous debates. For instance, whereas debates have rules to follow, there are no such requirements for polemical writings. Although it need not be the case, sometimes the polemical treatise is extremely aggressive and sometimes it even rhetorically disparages the opponent to score points. Without the chance for opponents to reply, or judges present to ensure that rules are followed, and misunderstandings or intentional misrepresentations corrected, polemical writers had a free hand. They are not always fair to the opponent. Personal attacks, insults, and abuses are often resorted to concerning items not germane to the points of discussion. Even in the western definitions of polemics referred to earlier, we find the use of adjectives such as “strong” or “aggressive.” This problem was not unique to the Indian philosophical tradition.

A few Sanskrit compendiums have critiques of opposing schools and systems of thought. One problem in locating such works that would be prior to the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* is lack of chronology, a painful fact to be reckoned with in all major philosophical developments in India. Some of the texts have also been lost. Three such works, however, are extant: Haribhadrasuri’s *Ṣad-darśana-samuccaya*, Śaṅkara’s *Sarva-siddhānta-saṁgraha*, and Mādhavācārya’s *Sarva-darśana-saṁgraha*; only the first two can be dated prior to the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*.

The *Civañāṉa Cittiyār’s* attack on other schools is fashioned after a Śaiva

---

authored by Buddhist logicians (Medieaval, up to 1200 CE), and (3) treatises written by Jaina logicians (Modern, from 900 CE). His catalog of treatises spans from circa 1500 BCE to 600 BCE when the science of inquiry (*Ānvīkṣikī*) morphed into an “art of debate,” then from circa 1 CE to 1200 CE when the science of “true reasoning” matured and developed; and finally from circa 900 CE onwards the “modern Indian logic” developed into a robust science. Typical treatises, which appeared during these three periods are the *Nyāya-sūtra* by Akṣapāda Gautama (circa 550 BCE), the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* by Dignāga (circa 500 CE) and the *Tattva-cintāmaṇi* by Gaṅgeśa (circa 1200 CE). Material in this footnote has been culled from several different sections of the classic work on the history of Indian Logic. See VIDYABHUSANA 1988 (Reprint).

classification with four categories.[209] The heterodox schools such as the Cārvāka, Jaina, and Bauddha are “outermost” (*puṟapuṟam*) in the sense that they are farthest removed from the basic tenets of Śaiva Siddhānta. They do not believe either in the Vedas, or in god. The next group, the "outer" (*puṟam*) schools are Nyāya, Mīmāṁsā, Ekātmavāda,[210] Sāṁkhya, Yoga, and Pāñcarātra. Although they recognize the authority of the Vedas, they do not accept the Śaivāgamas as authoritative. The "inner" (*akappuṟam*) schools are certain sub-schools of Śaivism, which, while regarding Śiva as the supreme god, do not agree to the scheme of categories set forth in the Śaiva Siddhānta. The last group of schools, the "innermost" (*akam*) also consists of Śaivism with certain doctrinal variations.[211] These accept all the categories detailed in the Śaiva Siddhānta, but they differ from it in defining some of the categories.[212] Thus, through criticism of rival systems from the most remote to proximate, the *Siddhāntin*, following the usual philosophic procedure, seeks to establish his view.

With these Tamil antecedents in mind, I will now examine the *Parapakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* to see what kind of style the author uses: debate, dialectics, or polemics. To determine if Aruṇanti resorts to polemics in evaluating other competing schools, I use a template with the following criteria: Use of *ad hominem* personal attacks, abusive language, pejorative name-calling, and foul

---

[209] *Puṟapuṟaccamayam* (outermost), *puṟaccamayam* (outer), *akappuṟaccamayam* (inner), and *akaccamayam* (innermost). See THIRUVILANGAM 2007:3-4.

[210] This group entails four different kinds of doctrines concerning ātmaṉ or cīvaṉ. (*ēkāṉmavātikaḷ: pāṟkariyaṉ, māyāvāti, cattappiramavāti*, and *kiṙīṭāppirammavāti*). See THIRUVILANGAM 2007:5.

[211] The six subgroups of "inner" (*akappuṟam*) schools are: pācupatar, māviratar, kāpālar, vāmamatattiṉar, vairavamatattiṉar, and aikyavātacaivar. The six subgroups of "innermost" (*akam*) schools are: pāṭāṇavāta caivar, pētavāta caivar, civacamavāta caivar, civacaṅkirāntavāta caivar, īcuvaravavikāravāta caivar, and civāttuvita caivar. See THIRUVILANGAM 2007:4.

[212] Followers of all these Śaiva groups and subgroups were one of two kinds—those whose chosen goal was nothing but liberation from the bondage of transmigration, and those who pursued supernatural powers and sought to enjoy the rewards. In all cases, the aspirants either sought liberation from life (cycle of birth and death) or sought enjoyment in life, here and now. See SANDERSON 2006:24-27.

means such as sophistry (*jalpa*), cavil (*vitaṇḍā*), quibble (*chala*), and futile rejoinders (*jāti*).

2.0 ANALYSIS OF SCHOOLS MENTIONED IN THE *CIVAÑĀṆA CITTIYĀR*

In the *Parapakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, Aruṇanti analyses the fourteen different philosophical schools that were in existence in different stages of development or decay in the Tamil country around the thirteenth century CE. As described earlier, Aruṇanti uses the classic *Pūrvapakṣin-Siddhāntin* pattern.[213] He begins the discussion of each system or school, by putting on the hat of the protagonist (*pūrvapakṣin*), and describes the main tenets of the school, ostensibly, as though he belongs to it. He sets the scene for the impending attack. Then he changes gear, puts on the hat of the adversarial school (*siddhāntin*), namely his own Śaiva Siddhānta (Śaiva Siddhāntin), and begins to comment on the basic philosophy of the opposing school.[214] The attacks are sometimes fair, and sometimes unfair. This clearly prepares the ground for the author to assert the supremacy of his school over the opposing schools, which he does in the second part of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* called the *Cupakkam*.[215]

Well-composed treatises written in such a genre will simulate an earnest debate. The truth will slowly emerge as the opponents peel off layer after layer with impeccable logic and sound reasoning. Contradiction and clarification devoid of any hostility will provide a great intellectual feast for the observers. Unfortunately, the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* does not follow that pattern. There are no rejoinders or comebacks. The *pūrvapakṣin*, that is Aruṇanti playing the role of the proponent of the opposing school, sets the scene outlining its tenets, and then follows through by attacking it. He thus portrays a picture where the opposing

---

[213] For an explanation of the standard "*Pūrvapakṣin-Siddhāntin*" (protagonist-antagonist) format used in Indian philosophical treatises, see footnote 181 of section 1.7.

[214] A note of caution about the terminology employed. The word *siddhāntin* means "one who establishes or proves his conclusions logically." See *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Monier-Williams. s.v. "siddhāntin" (p. 1216)*. This is the implied meaning when I refer to the *Pūrvapakṣin-Siddhāntin* (protagonist-antagonist) model employed in Indian philosophical treatises. However, in the context of the text that is being examined in the thesis, the *siddhāntin* happens to be the Śaiva Siddhāntin, one who belongs to the school of Śaiva Siddhānta.

[215] The word *Cupakkam* means literally "one's own side." (*svapakṣa* in Sanskrit).

school does not offer what his own school has to offer, thus establishing the superiority of his school. End of discussion. The text moves on to address the next school to be criticized, and the process is repeated with all the fourteen opposing schools.

In his analysis, Aruṇanti focuses on the following topics and positions the schools with their respective views: (1) perception (2) consciousness (3) individual self (4) first cause (5) creation, universe (6) ignorance, and (7) bondage and release.

Aruṇanti does not subject all the schools to the same degree of scrutiny. Of the fourteen schools discussed in the three-hundred-and-one verses of the *Parapakkam*, the distribution varies; for example, from seventy-one verses discussing the Sautrāntika Buddhist school to just two verses about the Vaibhāṣika Buddhist school. He concentrates on eight schools in two-hundred-and-sixty-seven verses and treats the other six schools marginally in twenty-three verses.[216]

Before I proceed to analyze Aruṇanti's composition, let me contextualize what Aruṇanti is trying to accomplish in the *Parapakkam*. His goal is to convince the readers of his treatise that the school he belongs to and speaks for is far better than the opposing schools. To appear as fair-minded, he outlines the principles of those schools supposedly without any bias, before the attack begins.

In analyzing the arguments constructed by Aruṇanti, I will examine the language and arguments used to discredit a particular school. I will identify the unfair punches offered by the author, if any, and will also highlight the instances where there are deliberate misrepresentations, which are set up as a decoy for a subsequent ambush; in other words, setting up a straw man. One of my goals in analyzing the *Parapakkam* is to determine whether the work is polemic. Why polemics? If we go with the dictionary definition, polemics is the practice of

[216] See Table 1 on page 345 for the distribution of verses in the *Parapakkam*.

theological controversy to refute errors of doctrines.[217] Most polemic works try to identify weak or vulnerable points in the tenets or philosophies of other schools before training their attacks on them. We have to examine how Aruṇanti handles the schools, which are competing with Śaiva Siddhānta. Are his arguments strictly on doctrinal issues? Are there any malicious or spiteful references beyond the realm of theology?

I will examine the set-up of all the fourteen schools addressed by Aruṇanti in the *Parapakkam* with a clear understanding that at the time that it was written in the thirteenth century there was stiff competition and the Śaiva Siddhānta school had to fight to claim its own turf and keep the competitions at bay.

[217] See *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. s.v. "polemic" (p. 959)*.

2.0 PRELIMINARIES[218]

In the first five verses, Aruṇanti offers his obeisance to several deities such as Kaṇapati (Gaṇapati, Gaṇeśa), Civaperumāṉ (Śiva), Cakti (Śakti), Vināyakar (Vināyaka, Vighneśvara), and Murukapperumāṉ (Muruka). In the sixth verse, he pays his respect to Meykaṇṭatēvar, his teacher (*kuruvaṇakkam*). In the seventh and eighth verses, Aruṇanti offers the customary expression of "modesty or an apologetic preface" (*avaiyaṭakkam*)[219] for the treatise, he has embarked on.

In the next verse, the author states the purpose of his work. For a cynic this verse might appear to be in total contradiction to the modesty expressed in the previous verse. He distinguishes those who have a clear understanding of a religion from those who have only a vague comprehension. He patronizes the former group and states that unlike the latter group of delusional people (*pittarkuṇam*) who are misled by false beliefs (*pētai yōrāy*), those who follow his treatise, which is based on the knowledge path of the Āgamas (*ākamaṅkaḷ elām*), will reach their goal.

In the tenth verse, Aruṇanti explains his lineage (*kuruparamparai*) and describes the genesis of his work along with the name of his treatise (*nūṟkatikāriyum*, *nūlvaḻiyum*, *nūṟpeyarum*). In the eleventh verse, Aruṇanti assures us that his treatise will clarify many fallacies advocated by other religions, and he will raise several questions and seek answers (*kaṭāviṭaiyāl*). One might see a mirage at a distance (*pēyttēr tōṉṟum*), but on getting close, the reality will become obvious; similarly, his treatise (*innūlil*) will expose the falsehoods (*tukaḷtīra*) of other schools and establish the truth (*colla kiṟpām*).

---

[218] See page 109 for translation of verses 1-11.
[219] See *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "avaiyaṭakkam"* (p. 159).

2.1 LOKĀYATA SCHOOL [220]

The Lokāyata school, also known as the Cārvāka school is an Indian atheistic, hedonistic, materialist school,[221] which identifies the soul with the body and denies pre-existence, future life, the law of *karma*,[222] heaven and hell, bondage and release, and the existence of god. The school considers perception, as the only means of valid knowledge and rejects the validity of other means such as inference, comparison, and verbal testimony. The school also rejects the authority of the Vedas and spurns Vedic ritualism and sacrifices. They question, "If the animal immolated in a sacrifice goes to heaven, why does the sacrificer not kill his father and send him to heaven—a consummation so devoutly to be wished?"

Aruṇanti Civācāriyār, in twenty-one verses, establishes the basic tenets and principles of the Lokāyata school and in thirty-one verses examines the validity of those principles.

The Lokāyata school has been subjected to ridicule for long; the very designations of its followers—Lokāyatas and Cārvākas—have acquired a disparaging tone, much as the term "sophist" did in ancient Greece, becoming synonyms for the infidel and the epicure.[223]

It is clear that the Lokāyatas are unique in many respects. Yet they are not the only ones who reject soul, god, and the supremacy of the Vedas. Some orthodox systems such as Sāṁkhya and Pūrva Mīmāṁsā do not believe in god. However, they cannot be equated with the Lokāyatas, because the Vedas are anathema to

---

[220] See page 121 for translation of verses 12-63.

[221] Materialism is the name given to the metaphysical doctrine, which holds that matter is the only reality. This doctrine tries to explain that, both mind and consciousness are the products of matter. Indian materialism is opposed to spiritual interpretations of the universe.

[222] The karmic theory, in its fundamental form, is a law of cause and effect. It is defined as, the sum of a person's actions in one of his successive states of existence, that will decide his fate, for the next.

[223] On a lighter note, the school is also referred to in Sanskrit as "sweet-tongued" (*cāru-vāka*), which aptly describes the advocates of a doctrine characterized by so much of superficial attractiveness.

the Lokāyatas. The Jainas do not believe in god either and have no faith in the Vedas; yet they have a theory of soul. The voice of the Lokāyata was the voice of revolt. They protested against age-long Vedic prescriptions. They took a stand against superstitions and prejudices that had stifled the freedom of thought. They were purely hedonistic and wanted to indulge in the sensual pleasures of life. They scoffed at and ridiculed the ideas of heaven, hell, and god. However, in the Indian philosophical context, the genuine questions and doubts raised by the Lokāyata school made the other schools stop and ponder. It made them careful to take note of the problems raised. They were forced to think more carefully and tone down their dogmatism and rigidity. It became *de rigeur* that every philosopher in India and every system of thought had to satisfy the Lokāyata to gain any legitimacy and approval. Thus, the contribution of the Lokāyata to the development of Indian thought is enormous.

For the Lokāyata, the only acceptable means of knowledge is by perception. Inference and authority are not valid methods of proof. The Śaiva Siddhāntin ridicules the Lokāyata for not accepting inference as a valid means of knowledge. If a person's father or mother had died when he was an infant, could the inference be negated, because there was no actual perception? When one hears thunder accompanied by lightening, and after a while sees the river swelling with floods, is it not possible to infer that there was rain, even though not perceived? Could one not infer the working of the senses without actual perception? There must be a cause for an effect to be displayed, just as a potter has to be there for creating a pot. Even if invisible, one can infer the existence of air, in air bubbles formed in water. Bubbles do not arise without a cause.

The Lokāyata negates the concept of god, *karumam* or *kaṉmam* (*karma* in Sanskrit), and *āṉmam* (*ātman* in Sanskrit). He uses vivid imagery and figure of speech to express his biting sarcasm! He reiterates that the world at large is being deceived by the advocates of other philosophies with their meaningless concepts of god, *karma,* and soul. Their claim about the non-existing entities is akin to that of a son of a sterile woman who got up on the horns of a hare and plucked a flower from the sky (like a pie in the sky).

The Lokāyata attacks the view that good or bad actions of persons done in this life will haunt them in their next life. In his example, he says that dead grass may reappear as grass again but only in the same place, not elsewhere. Therefore, he contends that such an argument is not tenable. Just as when food is consumed by a hungry man and the resulting excreta has no value, the actions done in this life are consummated here and now and have no future value**.**

In refusing the existence of a soul, which is supported by scriptural authority, the Lokāyata states that it is comparable to a person measuring a hare's horn and who claims validity for that. In refuting the concept of having a form and at the same time not having a form, the Śaiva Siddhāntin asks if a stone with a form can be suspended in space, which has no form. Even when the logic is slightly skewed, Aruṇanti injects humor in his arguments.

The importance of sensual pleasures to be enjoyed with women in this life is highlighted in several verses. In a clever way, Aruṇanti has the Lokāyata uses the names of the celestial divinities such as Śiva, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Indra and their association with their consorts to promote the hedonistic views of the Lokāyata school. Forsaking the pleasures available in this life for the sake of an illusory possibility of pleasure in the future, continues the author, is akin to a man who, feeling thirsty, leaves the water available next to him and runs after a beautiful mirage, only to die of greater thirst. Lokāyatas firmly believed that the only goal of man is enjoyment produced by sensual pleasures. There is only the present; there is no past, and there is no future. There is no heaven, no final liberation, nor any soul in another world. Pleasures and bodily comforts are transient. Warmth in winter would be desirable, but a cooler environment would be more pleasing during the summer. However, seeking Śiva would offer permanent pleasure. Carnal pleasures derived from union with women are fleeting in nature, while worshipping Śiva offers wealth of spiritual pleasure and permanent happiness.

Aruṇanti, presumably presenting the Lokāyata position, indulges in graphic erotic imagery of amorous displays of courting and copulation. With sarcasm, the Lokāyata chides those who follow a false austere path of mortification rather than a hedonistic pursuit of sensual pleasure. The Lokāyata firmly believes in fully

exploiting sensual pleasures without any consideration for the consequences of his actions. Vice and virtue mean the same. The only end of man is enjoyment produced by sensual pleasures.

I surmise that Aruṇanti in his desire to discredit the Lokāyata school has highly exaggerated the school's proclivity for carnal pleasure. It appears as though Aruṇanti is trying to create disgust among the readers by providing such details. For example, his description of the act of cunnilingus would easily be considered a deviant act by a purist reader.[224]

Acting as the *pūrvapakṣin*, Aruṇanti elucidates some of the principles of the Lokāyata school as though they were related by someone belonging to that school. However, it should be noted that the poet takes one aspect of the school, hedonism, and exaggerates it to serve his own purpose. In polemical debates, using an argument of this technique is called "an informal fallacy," also referred to as "attacking a straw man." Now the poet addresses the Lokāyata and starts to refute those principles basing his arguments on the tenets of Śaiva Siddhānta.

In his rebuttal, the Śaiva Siddhāntin declares that the sensual desirability of female bodies and the carnal pleasures offered by them are fleeting moments of joy and that beauty is only skin-deep.

If the Lokāyata claims that the senses are produced by the body without a first cause, just as silk is produced by a spider, then the author questions why the

---

[224] A personal note. In the structure of the *Parapakkam*, the author in his role as the protagonist (*pūrvapakṣin*) ostensibly establishes the framework of a school by highlighting its salient points. However, in fact, his critique already begins to color what is supposed to be his introductory exposition from the insider's, that is, the Lokāyata's perspective. In seven verses (26-32) in this section, for instance, the author describes the joys of carnal knowledge and how men could derive immense sexual pleasures in copulating with women. He goes far beyond a philosophical argument for the pursuit of pleasure by using graphic language in describing the female anatomy and the enjoyment it provides. The act of cunnilingus is graphically described. The language and contents of these verses border on pornography. At least two Tamil commentaries, out of modesty, have altogether skipped addressing these verses. I also thought of skipping the translation of these verses, not wanting to offend the examiner of my dissertation. When I checked with my thesis advisor, I was reminded that a scholar must display fidelity to the text. Therefore, I decided to proceed with the translation. See translation of verses starting on page 122, especially verses 26 to 32.

web of the spider is not produced from the sky, meaning without a cause. If life is to be produced randomly without a first cause, how could we explain the built-in order of gender, form, etc.? How could we explain the karmic effects that alone could produce experiences such as learning and enjoyment?

The Śaiva Siddhāntin lauds the spiritual attitude of the followers of Śiva and their lofty pursuits in studying the scriptures and the doctrines of the school. They shun indulgences in carnal pleasures and are focused on worshipping Śiva single-mindedly and in seeking salvation.

The Lokāyatas, besides denying god as the first cause, hold that matter causes mind. Should that be so, the Siddhāntin asks, why do we not see any mind in inanimate objects. If intelligence can only arise after the body is formed, then the Siddhāntin wants to know why there is no mind in a dead body. Should the Lokāyata suggest that death is due to the absence of *prāṇa*, the vital air, then why is there no consciousness in sleep? If everything can be explained away as nature's way of manifestation, then it must be uniform. If so, how could we explain the fact that there are gender differences in creation and how are we to explain the procreation process of the male and female species? Many arguments that are more interesting are available to establish the supremacy of Śaiva Siddhānta over the Lokāyata philosophy.

It is clear why the Siddhāntin attacks this school so vehemently: because the main tenets of this school are very attractive to many. Just enjoy life without any moral or ethical restraints, because after death, there is no heaven or hell. Enjoyment here and now without any restriction is real whereas any posthumous reward is speculative. Therefore, the opposing schools had a job cut out for them to steer people away from the Lokāyata camp to their domain.

2.2 SAUTRĀNTIKA SCHOOL[225]

Of the four Buddhist Schools addressed in the *Parapakkam*, the brunt of the attack is borne by the Sautrāntika School. Aruṇanti discusses this school in eighty-one verses, whereas he uses only eight verses to analyze the three other Buddhist schools combined (Yōgācāra, Mādhyamika, and Vaibhāṣika). The reader quickly gets the notion that reason could be that either this school posed the most threat to the Śaiva Siddhānta school or, perhaps, the Sautrāntika school had the most vulnerable points, which could be attacked.

The two main schools of Hīnayāna Buddhism[226] are the Vaibhāṣikas and the Sautrāntikas, and they both sprang out of the Sarvāstivāda school, which holds that everything exists (*sarva asti*). They consider the elements, mental and physical, to be real. The main difference between these two Theravāda schools are that while the Vaibhāṣikas hold that external objects are real and perceptible, the Sautrāntikas hold that external objects are real and inferable. Sautrāntikas recognize the reality of external objects and consider them as objects of inference. They further hold that if external objects are nonexistent, an internal cognition cannot appear to be an external object.

The Sautrāntikas developed the doctrine of impermanence into the ontological doctrine of momentariness, and it is the prime mover behind all other dogmas of this school. For them, all objects of the world are undergoing destruction every moment, but they appear to persist owing to illusion; all external objects are real and inferable. The school has a contrary view to those of the Vedas, albeit that the Vedas have high moral principles and paths of virtue and righteousness.

Aruṇanti introduces the Sautrāntika school with a clear suggestion that it is

---

[225] See page for158 translation of verses 64-134.

[226] "Hīnayāna ("Lesser Vehicle") - A term coined by the Mahāyānists to describe their opponents, whose path they characterized as selfish and inferior to their own. Traditionally the term is said to encompass eighteen schools of Indian Buddhism. The only Hīnayāna school that survives today is Theravāda, whose members reject the label the 'Lesser Vehicle'." See POWERS 2000:93. The designation and use of "Hīnayāna" has fallen out of favor in academic circles, and the school is usually referred to as Theravāda.

superior among the four Buddhist Schools, because the school does not consider caste to be important. The fact that the Sautrāntika school is introduced as the superior among the four Buddhist schools and does not recognize caste distinctions[227] makes one wonder if this principle is highlighted as a major difference between Sautrāntika and the other three schools or if it is a principle shared by all the four schools. Aruṇanti is rather ambiguous! However, he makes one comment that will force the reader to ponder about it. The last sentence reads, "Of these four Buddhists, the Sautrāntikas come first because their principles do not recognize any caste differences." This implies that the other three schools recognize the caste system. That is not true. Buddhism emerged as an altruistic school. Over time, it developed antagonism towards Brahmanism, not only from a religious point of view but also at social and cultural levels. One of the attractions for many low-caste members to embrace other religions, be it Buddhism or Islam, even today, is the comfort that other religions offer in treating everyone equally. All proselytes long for that equity and fairness in caste-oriented societies. A homogeneous society without any social hierarchy based on birthrights is very alluring. This is true with all Buddhist schools. To single out one school and brand it as superior to others is misleading. Even a casual reader will recognize that Aruṇanti is adding something to the mix that is not warranted.

One of the major differences between the Sautrāntika and the Śaiva Siddhānta schools is the metaphysics of *jīva* or the soul. Buddhist schools do not recognize the existence of a permanent, "partless," substantial "self" or soul.[228] The Śaiva Siddhāntins consider souls to be eternal entities. Aruṇanti highlights the difference and in the process fails to establish that the activities of the body clearly demonstrate that the soul acts as the orchestrator or the puppeteer. He devotes only six verses to analyze the concept of "soul."

The Buddhist protagonist asks, If a human being has a soul (or intelligence),

---

[227] "*puttar nālvariṉum …cauttirāntikaṉ …cātitāṉ ilāta koḷkai" Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 64.*

[228] For Buddhists, the soul is merely a conceptual construct. Every individual is in fact composed of a constantly changing collection of "aggregates" (*skandha*s). See POWERS 2000:21.

as suggested by the Śaiva Siddhāntin, then why does that person not grasp a cognitive experience without the aid of internal or external senses? Why does the soul need the external sensations and books (scriptures) to have the experience? If the Śaiva Siddhāntin argues that the soul understands by uniting with the five senses, by contacts with sensations, and by poring over books (Vedas), then he should not have any doubts of the color of a cloth in darkness, if it is red or blue. Not knowing, he wonders. In other words, the soul needs the help of the senses to experience and appropriate the knowledge that the cloth is red or blue. The soul knows nothing in the absence of the senses. Since the senses are not intelligent, the soul understands something in union with the senses.

It will be erroneous to say that a single soul pervades the whole world, because there is a multitude of lives with different characteristics. They all appear with different bodies. If we say the soul is formless, then it cannot be attached to a body with form; if it has form, it cannot be contained in another body. If we say the soul is an atom, then it will disappear without staying in the body through many of its openings. Therefore, the soul cannot be atomic. If it is eternal, then it should not be capable of appearance and disappearance.

It cannot be true that the soul is omnipresent because our knowledge does not extend everywhere. Furthermore, there are bodily differences. If the soul is said to pervade the whole body, then it will disappear with the death of the body. If the soul is resident in any one location of the body, like the head, then it simply cannot have consciousness (awareness) in any other part of the body, like the feet.[229]

If, in addition to knowledge, and the object of knowledge, a knower is postulated, then the Śaiva Siddhāntin might ask if that knower is sentient or insentient. If insentient, it is material like earth. If sentient, i.e. the knower is

[229] The Śaiva Siddhāntin considers intelligence as material and insentient and soul as non-material and sentient.

knowledge itself, then it is like saying that 'dhal rice' has dhal for its curry.[230]

The Sautrāntika Buddhist poses a question about "time" to the Śaiva Siddhāntin. "How does your Time operate?" Then he continues in verse 82, "If you say it is that by which all things undergo creation, sustenance and dissolution, then it (time) will be confused with the objects themselves; time will cease, when such objects cease to exist." To assert that there are three kinds of time, and not three kinds of objects, is clearly a wrong belief. If time is identified with the objects, then when the objects perish, time also should perish. Only the objects have three modes of existence, not the time. According to Aruṇanti, to assert that there are three kinds of time is a clear case of wrong belief.

Shifting the focus to the creator and creation, the Sautrāntika states in verse 86, "You suggest that a god created the earth. If the earth existed before creation, it needs no creation. If it did not exist before, then it cannot be created (i.e. then there is no need to create it). If you say creation means creating the effect from its cause, then the world must be said to both exist and not exist." If the world already existed, to say god created it, will be a self-contradiction according to the Sautrāntika. Furthermore, what already exists need not be created.

In the next forty verses, Aruṇanti as the protagonist of the Śaiva Siddhānta school attacks the Sautrāntika school in earnest. I am selectively describing some of the points and few of the interesting metaphors.

Aruṇanti begins the salvo with an *ad hominem* attack by calling the Sautrāntika "ignorant" because he does not understand the basic principles of his own faith.

"If you say that god created the world as a potter makes a pot out of clay, where did god stay when he made this world? If you say he stood on the world, then the world should have been created beforehand. If you say he was

---

[230] It must be understood here that the Sautrāntikas consider knowledge as part of the knower. The example cited is that both '*dhal'* and 'rice' form an integral part of '*dhal* rice.' It would be a fallacy of repetition to consider dhal as a curry for *dhal* rice.

everywhere, and omnipresent, then that “everywhere” must have existed before god created it. If you say god created the world out of nothing, out of his own mercy, where were his grace and mercy when creating vicious creatures like tigers and snakes? If you suggest he created such creatures to exhibit his might, then you may as well worship a lunatic.” Aruṇanti, as the Śaiva Siddhāntin, uses abrasive comments to establish the atheistic nature of Buddhism.

The Buddhists recognize neither a soul nor a god, and it is like supplying oil and wick to a lamp that has been put out. The Siddhāntin establishes that if the Buddhists argue that the rites performed for the dead yield benefits to the performer, then they tacitly acknowledge the existence of souls, as well as a supreme being for administering such benefits.

If your Buddha gave out his *dharma* after attaining *nirvāṇa*, then his speech after *nirvāṇa* is like that of a person who died by eating ghee and honey together, then coming to life again to say that it is bad to eat ghee and honey together. Another attempt by the Śaiva Siddhāntin to belittle Buddha is evident from the suggestion that he did not attain salvation and hence his words need not be given any credence. A clear attempt to destroy the pedestal.

If it was Buddha’s proud desire to save others, it is akin to that of a person, who, without knowing the enormity of rushing floods desires to cross the river and land his entourage on the other side of the river. This is a couched attempt to discredit the Buddha by implying that he was trying to redeem people without proper appreciation of the perils one could encounter. Aruṇanti gives another example. For Buddha to be born and getting himself released from the cycle of birth and death, and at the same time trying to save others is like a deer trying to save its kind from the hunter’s nets when that deer itself is entrapped. A teacher without a vision.

The Buddhists hold that the Buddha was born on this earth to teach compassion and dharma or righteous behavior. The Siddhāntin ridicules such a claim by asking how someone could preach compassion and dharma when he kills his own mother as he was born by tearing off his mother’s abdomen. In many traditions, there are accounts of miraculous births, in which religious

figures did not pollute themselves at birth by the usual uterine birth. Buddha's birth is another example of such myths being perpetuated to create some wonderment in a supernatural setting. To the Buddhist claim that he had taken several births, and in all of them, he preached *dharma* and abhorred evil acts like murder, the Siddhāntin poses a question; how did the Buddha manage not to kill a life when he was born as a lion or a tiger? If he observed *dharma*, did he satisfy his hunger by eating straw? How did he practice his *dharma* when he came across a woman who was being a prostitute after deserting her husband, or when he came across a hunter who killed birds with a noose? This is a suggestion that the emperor has no clothes.

Aruṇanti taunts the Buddhist, "You assert that it is not a sin to eat a slaughtered animal. Then why do you not offer that meat to your god, the Buddha? When you despise your own body as unclean, where is your sense when you eat the flesh of lower forms of lives?" He sarcastically points out the unclean practice of the Buddhist.

Pointing out the untenability of the Buddhist theory of momentariness in holding that the Buddha maintained his intelligence through a continuum of moments, Aruṇanti rebukes the Buddhist by saying that treatises composed under such circumstances should be the words of a mad man.

The fundamental concepts in Buddhism also deny the existence of space, time, and direction, besides soul. Of course, there is also no god. However, for the Siddhāntin, they are all real entities. Space is all-pervasive which allows movements of objects. Space is not light or darkness. It offers a substratum for both. Time has its divisions of past, present, and future. At a lower level, it has divisions of time like morning, evening and night. Time is ever changing. The cardinal points or directions are eternal and invariable.

For the Siddhāntin the idea of god is not a mere figment or fabrication of his mind. It is so central that it gives meaning to and validates the very idea of existence. god exists. god is the first cause as well as a necessary cause. Souls and the world are the beneficiaries. In verse 128, the Śaiva Siddhāntin states, "The potter works on clay which is the first cause with the wheel, stick, etc.,

which are the auxiliary causes; we know the result will be a pot or a jar and not a cloth." Other books of the Śaiva Siddhānta canon provide the nucleus for a teleological argument or argument from design.

The Buddhists show reverence to their scriptures and consider them holy. The Siddhāntin contemptuously holds that these holy texts are given by a gourmand who eats meat before sunrise and with an unwashed dirty face. A clear case of *ad hominem* attack is evident.

Instead of knowing the consciousness as a subject and other things as objects, the Buddhists reverse the order, which makes consciousness the object, and the senses, the subject. The Siddhāntin points out the absurdity. If the Buddhists argue that the consciousness perishes and emerges at the same instant, then creation and destruction must become one activity.

Buddhists claim that each part of "knowledge" is produced from a different "knowledge." The Siddhāntin very cleverly points out that since the Buddhists claim momentariness to knowledge, one part of knowledge cannot be permanent to cause another. If the Buddhists say that the body creates it, then such knowledge should persist in deep sleep too. However, our observation precludes this.

2.3 YŌGĀCĀRA SCHOOL[231]

Aruṇanti uses one verse to state the position of the Yōgācāra school and two verses to refute its position. Obviously, he did not consider the school important enough to merit more attention.

The Yōgācāra school denies the existence of the external world, which is in total opposition to the Śaiva Siddhānta view that holds the phenomenal world and the souls in them to be real. The Yōgācāra school considers that intellect is the only reality (*cakam uḷatu aṟivēyām*), and it evolves as senses (*pōtamē poruḷāyt tōṉṟum*), which, in turn, perceive objects (*poruḷatāy eḷalāl pōtam*). Because intelligence has no form, whatever is experienced through the senses is like an experience in a dream (*kaṉavē pōlum*).

Aruṇanti challenges the Yōgācāra position by stating that it is wrong to hold that intellect is different from sense experiences, and it is equally wrong to suggest that they are the same. Furthermore, as dreams contain objects encountered in waking life, the world cannot be a dream. If the consciousness and matter are united, then they will appear coalesced as one, just as a crystal assumes the color of the object it reflects.

Even while elucidating the tenets from the Yōgācāra perspective, Aruṇanti uses a polemic tone in branding the school's position as based on ignorance (*uṇarviṉāl*).

---

[231] See page 224 for translation of verses 135-137.

2.4 MĀDHYAMIKA SCHOOL[232]

Aruṇanti presents the position of the Mādhyamika school in one verse and offers his rebuttal in two verses. The school holds that the body is simply an aggregate of the senses. When the senses perish, nothing is left behind, and hence there is no intelligence without the body. In establishing the basic tenets of the nihilistic school of Mādhyamika, Aruṇanti ridicules the school for its negation of intelligence associated with the body. He points out the faulty logic (*navaitaru mo̲liyiṉālē*) of the school in holding that, as there is no body, there can be no intelligence inherent in the body.

The Mādhyamika Buddhist considers that only characteristics or attributes constitute the body and not matter. Aruṇanti points out that the characteristics of a pot are not seen in a cloth (*avayavaṅkaḷ kaṭattiṉil pukāmal paṭattiṉil*), and the characteristics of a cloth cannot be seen in a pot (*avayavaṅkaḷ paṭattiṉil pukāmal kaṭattiṉil*). Both characteristics and matter should unite and coalesce together to form an object. Similarly, the body and the soul or consciousness is formed as substance and its characteristics.

In the concluding verse, Aruṇanti stresses that the soul is an essential element in making cognition feasible. It has to unite itself with the senses and the objects. Both the soul and its intelligence (*uḷḷa tame pōtamum*) are real.

[232] See page 227 for translation of verses 138-140.

2.5 VAIBHĀṢIKA SCHOOL[233]

In his account of the last Buddhist school, the Vaibhāṣikas, Aruṇanti summarizes the school's position one verse, and refutes it in one verse.

The school holds that the direct contact between the senses and objects creates knowledge. Because Vaibhāṣikas believe that perception results in recognition of external objects, even inference is subordinate to perception. According to them, when consciousness and the perception of an object combine, cognition will take place just as a red color results (*vantu e̲luntāl aruṇam pōla*) when turmeric (*aricaṉam*) is mixed with lime (*nūṟu kūṭa*). The Buddhist asserts that if one understands this doctrine, then the Buddha's abode can be reached.

As the antagonist, Aruṇanti points out the fallacy of the school's claim. Because the objects to be perceived are external while the knowledge gained is internal, they cannot combine (*ceṉṟu cērntiṭum iṉṟām*) to facilitate cognition. Besides, knowledge is without form (*aruvu*), while the objects perceived (*ñēyam*) have forms (*uruvam*). Hence, the school's claim is negated.

[233] See page 229 for translation of verses 141-142.

2.6 NIGAṆḌAVĀDA SCHOOL[234]

The Jaina system has no god, nor does it accept the authority of the Vedas. The Tamil name for the Jain teacher Arhadbali is Arukatēvaṉ (Arukaṉ)[235] and the Jains hold him as their focus of worship and adoration; they consider him devoid of any evil qualities. Observing severe austerities, he became an *Arhat* and attained the highest position in creation. He then imparted his knowledge to his followers, in "one mystical word."[236] From the knowledge obtained from this one mystical word, his followers wrote several treatises, including one on Yoga. They established the concepts of righteous or dharmic bodies and non-righteous or adharmic bodies. They also outlined what constitutes a righteous act, which will yield merit, and what constitutes an evil act, which will produce demerit. Righteous acts are conducive to the virtuous body, and non-righteous acts always cause adharmic bodies.

Jainas further elucidate what causes bondage, and how one can attain salvation by getting rid of one's attachments. They also defined "time" as something that extends from the past to the present, and to the future, all in one moment. Extending this concept, the followers of Arukatēvaṉ establish that the soul, which is limited by time, is present in the body and fills it completely; it passes through periods of youth, adolescence, and old age. In addition, the soul is intelligent and eternal.

Jainas consider that even inanimate objects such as stones have a soul. The

---

[234] See page 230 for translation of verses 143-164.

[235] He is also referred to as Ārukataṉ in Tamil Jaina literature. See MUDALIAR 1988:90.

[236] "…*mēliruntu* ***orucol*** *ikalaṉukku aruḷum eṉṟaṉaṉ*." *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 146*.The reference to "one word" (*orucol*) is rather obscure. Aruṇanti neither elaborates on that, nor gives any clue. However, Irāmanāta Piḷḷai, in his commentary states that, that single word refers to "*pañcāstamayam*," but does not provide any explanation. See PIḶḶAI 1975:71. Cinkaravelu Mutaliar in his commentary also states the same word without providing any clarification. See MUTALIAR 1910:219. I speculate that the word refers to the five Jaina ontological categories (*pañca astikāya*): *jīvāstikāya*, *ajīvāstikāya*, *dharmāstikāya*, *adharmāstikāya*, and *pudgalāstikāya*, representing *jīva*, *ajīva*, *dharma*, *adharma*, and *pudgala* respectively. See *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Monier-Williams. s.v. "astikāya" (p. 122)*.

six kinds of perception, such as sight and taste, which cause evil or sins, constitute shackles for the soul. When austerities are performed, good *karma* results and releases the soul from the control of these senses. Performing austerities will also result in good births. They hold that when we get rid of both *puṇya,* meaning accumulated virtue or merit, and *pāpa,*[237] which are accumulated sins or evil acts, by experiencing the effects produced by them by repeated births, we attain salvation.

Aruṇanti does not shy away from *ad hominem* attacks. As he starts the introduction, he ridicules the Jaina monks for worshipping the *Aśoka* tree (*acōku pēṇi*) and criticizes them for wandering around without clothes (*uṭai akaṉṟu*). Either intentionally to discredit them, or due to his own limited knowledge about the Jainas, Aruṇanti brands them as naked wandering monks. Only the *Digambara* ("clothed in space") sect went about stark naked, as a sign that they did not belong to any recognized group, sect, trade, or community. Some holy men changed the custom and started donning the white garment and their sect came to be known as *Śvetāmbara* ("clothed in white").[238] Is that a sign of setting up a "straw man"?

Austerity measures have no value, Aruṇanti says, if not accompanied by physical hygiene and cleanliness (*māciṉai aṭaintu*). He calls the monks filthy due to not bathing. The monks are also blamed for being gargantuan eaters (*paṇṭipaṭa uṇṭu*).[239] Portraying the monks as gluttons is the author's way of pointing out the chasm between the one who is worshipped and his followers.[240] It is worth examining how another compendium characterizes the same attributes

---

[237] *puṇyam* and *pāpam* in Tamil.

[238] ZIMMER 1974:158. "We know that at the time of the historical Buddha and of Mahāvīra there were two kinds of Jainas: the followers of Pārśva, who wore clothes, and the followers of Mahāvīra, who were naked. Is it possible that the early Buddhists included the naked Jainas in the general category of Ājīvikas, so that the Jainas mentioned in the Buddhist canon are primarily followers of Pārśva?" See BRONKHORST 2000:512.

[239] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 143.*

[240] "[Arukaṉ has conquered all bodily needs and] he is beyond (*ivai viṭṭu*) hunger (*pacittal*), thirst (*tākam*)…." *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 146*.

(in Sanskrit).[241]

The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out that there is an inherent ambiguity in determining a body to be virtuous or vicious without any clear criteria. He further points out the untenability of the Jaina argument that individuals can work out their salvation by perfect living, without any assistance or favors from a god. The embodied soul, after getting rid of all evils, becomes a perfect being as well as a "master" to other embodied souls. Such an elevated soul becomes the one to be worshipped. The Śaiva Siddhāntin argues that such a leader or model to be worshipped is not a god in the theistic sense and states that there needs to be a supreme being to make Arukatēvaṉ a perfect master. (No doubt, Aruṇanti has Śiva in mind).

The Śaiva Siddhāntin accuses Arukatēvaṉ, as a celestial deity, of not being in touch with his followers because he is living in luxury in a golden castle. As such, he will not be in tune with the grievances and miseries of the people. If he is not aware of their grievances, how could he mitigate them? If he knows the grievances, then he, too, will be inflicted by them. Again, the Śaiva Siddhāntin tries to show that the Jaina celestial being is in no way comparable to Śiva.

The Śaiva Siddhāntin identifies a controversial position. The Jaina asserts that Arukatēvaṉ is omniscient and does not need the senses and mind. Yet he says that Arukatēvaṉ is embodied and immortal which, in turn, affirms the existence of senses and mind. In the absence of senses and mind, seldom can one comprehend things. On the other hand, if he has no body, then it is difficult to say that he is omniscient.

The Jaina had said that the perfect master derived the knowledge from the one mystical word uttered to him by his master. The Śaiva Siddhāntin challenges

---

[241] *"mayūrapicchahastāste kṛtavīrāsanādikāḥ*
pāṇipātreṇa bhuñjānā lūnakeśāśca mauninaḥ." Sarva-siddhānta-saṅgraha 14.
"They carry the feathers of peacocks in their hands (*mayūrapicchahastāste*) and are accomplished in adopting the various postures [prescribed for yogic meditation], such as 'the posture of the hero', etc. (*kṛtavīrāsanādikāḥ*). They eat (*bhuñjānā*) out the 'vessels' consisting of [their own] hands (*pāṇipātreṇa*) and have their hairs cut (*lūnakeśāśca*), and are engaged in silent meditation (*mauninaḥ*)." See RANGACARYA 2006:15. (My translation from Sanskrit).

the Jaina by pointing out the logical paradox that, if the perfect master did not have any senses, how could he have heard the word and how could he have passed it on? "Without a mind, how could he understand anything? [242] Without a mind, how did he manage to compose a treatise? [243] This is comparable (*atu okkumē*) to a dumb person teaching another dumb person (*ūmar ūmarukku uraitta vāṟu*) [i.e., the blind leading the blind]".

In criticizing the Jaina for advocating self-mortification and pain to reach heaven, the Śaiva Siddhāntin asks him why he is not cutting off his nose so that he could enjoy imperishable bliss. He also pokes fun at the Jaina concept of *karma*.

The Jains hold that although the human soul is formless, it resides in the body; this is not acceptable to the Śaiva Siddhāntin who argues that it is illogical to say, that the soul assumes form in accordance with the shape of the body. Furthermore, any imperfection of the body will be reflected as an imperfection of the soul. In addition, if the soul lives in the body, what happens to the soul when the body dies? How could water in a pot be salvaged when the pot is broken? Again, Aruṇanti ridicules what he perceives to be false logic of the Jainas.

The Jaina position that a soul can reach heaven without the help of a first cause is next challenged by the Śaiva Siddhāntin, who likens this view to a pot at the bottom of a well, trying to reach the top of the well, on its own, without anyone lifting it.[244] The author ridicules the Jaina for suggesting that a soul can reach the golden abode of the master after all past *karma* have been used up. Because *karma* is endless, the author muses that this is like a cat waiting for the ocean to dry up, so that it can eat the fish.[245] Most of the metaphors used by Aruṇanti have sarcastic humor attached to them.

---

[242] "*…oruvi niṉṟatu eṉṉil attam oṉṟaiyum uṇarntiṭāṉ." Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 153.*

[243] "*…nallavām maṇātitāṉ illaiyām maṇātitāṉ iyampu māṟatu eṅṅaṉē?" Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 155.*

[244] "*…akkuṭam kūval maṉṉum nīḷkarai kuṟittu vēṟōruttaṉ akkuṭattai mītu niṉṟu eṭukkavē." Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 164.*

[245] "*…pūñai niṉṟatē teṇ kaṭal nīr vaṟanta pōtu mīṉ arunta." Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 163.*

If Arukaṉ were to be compared to the "coolness of the moon", the Śaiva Siddhāntin pokes fun at this simile by saying that then just as the moon waxes and wanes, Arukaṉ's greatness should also wax and wane.[246] This is a clear polemic attempt to take a metaphor or a simile and interpret in in a different, damaging context.

In verse 146, Aruṇanti, while advocating the cause of the Nigaṇḍavādin, makes a mistake in identifying the number of "endurances" as seventeen whereas there are strict rules among the Jaina monks and nuns to observe twenty-two.[247] This is another clue that Aruṇanti did not have a clear understanding of the Jaina tenets.

[246] "*…cītamā matikku aṭaintaper̲r̲iyēl oruvum iṭṭa oppu." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 151.*

[247] "There was at an early date abstracted from the textual delineation of these austerities what became a stereotyped list of twenty-two "endurances" (*parīṣaha*) [*pariṣaha*?], physical and mental afflictions which are regarded as encompassing all the difficulties to which Jain ascetics have always been subjected. Every Jain and monk and nun, through the hardships of fasting and mendicancy, partly replicates Mahāvīra's austerities." See DUNDAS 2002:28.

2.7 ĀJĪVIKA SCHOOL[248]

Aruṇanti highlights the important aspects of the Ājīvika school in ten verses and offers the rebuttal in six verses.

The Ājīvika school[249] (also called Ājīvika), founded by Makkhali Gosāla (5th century BCE)[250] is often mistakenly identified as a Jaina sub-school. There are several views on how the name of the school originated. Jarl Charpentier opines that it was a nickname given to them by their opponents meant to denigrate them as practitioners of asceticism just to gain a livelihood.[251]

The school prospered between the sixth century BCE and the fourteenth century CE.[252] The Ājīvika community dwindled rapidly in Northern India around the third century BCE, but it survived longer in South India. Surprisingly, in spite of heavy taxation and other harassments by Hindu kings and village communities, it lasted until the fourteenth century.

---

[248] See page 247 for translation of verses 165-180.

[249] Llewellyn Basham provides an interesting examination of the etymology of the word Ājīvika. "The former [Bernouf] believed that the term had no derogatory significance, but meant "one who lives on the charity of others," deriving it from *a-jīva*, "the absence of livelihood," with the addition of the suffix *–ka* and the consequent lengthening by *vṛddhi* of the initial vowel. As an alternative explanation Bernouf […] on the basis of a similar etymology, believed that the word meant an ascetic who ate no living or animal food. Neither of these interpretations is acceptable." See BASHAM 1951:101.

"…and the name of the school means 'Followers of the Way of Life'." DUNDAS 2002:28.

[250] For a good description of his life, see BASHAM 1951:34-66.

[251] See CHARPENTIER 1913:669.

Johannes Bronkhorst weighs in with his views on the name of the school. "Our hypothesis to the extent that the early Buddhists used the term Ājīvika to refer to all naked religious wanderers, including the Jainas who followed Mahāvīra, does not exclude that there may have been "real" Ājīvikas, wanderers who used this expression to refer to themselves, and who may have followed one or more specific teachers and shared among themselves a specific school doctrine." See BRONKHORST 2000:517.

[252] "Out of the philosophical ferment of the sixth century B.C. at least three unorthodox sects developed in the same region, all seeking more satisfying explanations of the cosmic mystery and those of sacrificial brāhmaṇism [*sic*] and the Upaniṣadic gnosis. These sects were built around the doctrines of Buddha, Mahāvīra, and Gosāla, about each of whom a great body of legend accumulated. From this unreliable material, it would seem that Gosāla was at one time closely associated with Mahāvīra, the Jaina *tīrthaṅkara*, but that later their partnership was broken." BASHAM 1951:278.

The Ājīvika school is a fatalist or a determinist school, and it holds that the world is governed by necessity, and Fate determines everything. Sometimes the school is referred to as *svabhāvavāda*, meaning everything in the phenomenal world is caused and determined by its own inherent nature without any influence from an external agency.[253] Although Makkhali Gosāla is generally regarded as having been the head of the ascetic order of Ājīvikas, for practical purposes, this school is considered an early Buddhist school,[254] notwithstanding the fact there were conflicts and competitions among different schools fighting for a niche. It was a common practice for schools to discredit other schools by indulging in polemic writings and disparaging comments. It was merely to attract new followers who could be convinced to abandon their original allegiance and join their newfound school.[255]

The school recognizes five substances—earth, water, fire, air, and soul, which are manifested as hardness, cool nature, hot nature, movement, and intelligence.[256] Except for the soul, the other four substances do not have any intelligence, nor could they be changed into the other. In addition, they are eternal. The Ājīvika treatise states that although the soul is present in bodies with forms, they are invisible to human eyes; they are visible only to the celestials.

Aruṇanti introduces the Ājīvikas with a sarcastic comment, which perhaps suggests that he does not have a deep understanding of the basic tenets of the

---

[253] Surendranath Dasgupta states, "…the two important points that we need to take note of here [are] that the Ājīvikas, who were an important sect did not believe in the efficiency of our will or our karma and regarded sex-indulgence as unobjectionable to recluses." See DASGUPTA 1988:525.

[254] See Bronkhorst for the account of an encounter between the Buddha and a Ājīvika called Upaka. BRONKHORST 2000:511.

[255] One could speculate that the Jains and Buddhists deliberately distorted Ājīvika doctrine for their own polemical purposes. It is possible that Mahāvīra and early Jainism were influenced by Ājīvika teachings. There are, for example, inconsistencies in the theory of karma in the Jaina doctrine that could be explained with reference to what little is known of Ājīvika doctrine. For Gosāla, "belief in free will was a vulgar error." Instead, the fundamental principle of Ājīvika philosophy was "Fate," usually called *Niyati*. See BASHAM 1951:220, 226-235.

[256] "*…aṇukkaḷ aintu nilampuṉal aṉalkāl cīvaṉ… pāratu kaṭiṉam cītam tarumpuṉal cuṭumtī vāyuc calittuṭum uyirpō tattām." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 166.*

Ājīvika school. “Plucking hair” from one’s head is not unique to the Ājīvikas, and it is a practice observed by Jainas too.[257] This practice observed by both Jainas and Ājīvikas appears to be part of an initiation process. As Aruṇanti begins the introduction of the school, by mistake he identifies the Ājīvikas as part of the Jaina school, which they are not.[258]

It is evident from Aruṇanti’s account that he had met only some Ājīvikas on the fringe of their faith or at least he was familiar with only those Ājīvikas who had moved far in the direction of Jainism without completely losing their identity. Aruṇanti talks about their practice of severe austerities, the habit of pulling hair from their heads, the doctrine of atomism, and the *niyati* principle of determinism.

One belief common to both Jainas and Ājīvikas, besides the customs of severe asceticism, nudity, and pulling out the hair is their concept of *abhijāti*s or classes of humanity.[259] *Abhijāti*s are classified in Pāli texts as Black (*kaṇha*), Blue (*nīla*), Red (*lohita*), Green (*halidda*), White (*sukka*), and Supremely White (*parama-sukka*).[260] The list of colors stated by the Śaiva Siddhāntin seems to be without order: white (*veṇmai*), golden (*poṉmai*) red (*cemmai*), pure white (*kaḷiveṇmai*),blue (*nīlam*), and green (*paccai*). The black color is omitted and the disorderly arrangement of the colors suggests that Aruṇanti, the author of Civañāṉa Cittiyār, was unaware of the specific classification.[261]

---

[257] *“talaiyiṉaip paṟittu” Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 165.*

“Nakedness, as we have seen, is in the Buddhist texts primarily, or even exclusively, associated with the Ājīvikas, and never with the Jainas; the remaining characteristics—baldness, squatting, pulling out hair and beard—are found among the latter as well.” See BRONKHORST 2000:518. See also footnote 238.

[258] “*ācivakaṉ amaṇarkaḷiṟ” Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 165.*

[259] See BASHAM 1951:265.

[260] See BASHAM 1951:243.

[261] Aruṇanti does not provide any reason or clue to distinguish “white” (*veṇmai*) from “pure white” (*kaḷiveṇmai*), nor does he explain their relevance. However, Basham traces the color classification of Aruṇanti to Maṇimēkalai, a long Buddhist narrative poem attributed to Cēkkiḻār. See BASHAM 1951:239.

See also HOERNLE 1951:259-268 *(Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics)*. It is worth pointing out that the article about the Ājīvikas in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*—albeit the title is dated—is exhaustive and has a wealth of information. The parallels and the differences among the Buddhist, Jaina, and Ājīvika schools are well documented.

In the concluding verse of the Ājīvika position,[262] Aruṇanti once again displays his confusion between the metaphysics of Jaina and Ājīvika schools. He states that [Arukaṉ] has added two more categories of vice (*puṇṇiyam*) and sin (*pāvam*) to the five substances (earth, water, fire, air, and soul) of the Ājīvika school making it seven (*ēḻeṉa*). According to the Jaina metaphysics, the existent realities are classified as either *Jīva* or *Ajīva*. The *Jīva* includes five aspects of *pudgala*, *ākāśa*, *kāla*, *dharma*, and *adharma*, and collectively the categories are referred to as *astikāya*s.[263] There is agreement among the three chief Tamil sources, which refer to the Ājīvika school—*Maṇimēkalai*, *Nīlakēci*, and *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*; they all declare that, according to the Ājīvika doctrine, there are five immutable atomic elements (*aṇu* or *poruḷ*): earth, air, water, fire, and life (*uyir* or *cīvam*). The *Maṇimēkalai*, however, the oldest of these sources, adds, "but joy and sorrow, these two are atoms." Nīlakēci leaves the total of the elements at five, but the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, in verse 174, states, "Our Lord has declared to us the seven which we must consider, including these two which are joined with them, namely good and evil."

It is worth examining the expression used by Aruṇanti in the concluding verse: "the one we are attached to" (*eṅkaḷōṭē naṇṇiya oruvaṉ*). If the word "the one" refers to Arukaṉ, then he mistakenly refers to the Jaina deity as the deity of the Ājīvikas.[264] By using "we" (*eṅkaḷ*) does he mean "we, the Ājīvikas" or "we, Ājīvikas and Jainas"? At best, we could only notice and document the ambiguity.

---

[262] *"puṇṇiya pāvam eṉṉum iraṇṭu aṇup porunta vaittē*
eṇṇiya ivaṟṟi ṉōṭum ēḻeṉa eṅka ḷōṭē
naṇṇiya oruvaṉ kūṟum ñāṉamiv vāṟatu eṉṟu
kaṇṇiya karutti ṉōrkaḷ katiyiṉaik kāṇpar eṉṟāṉ." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 174.

[263] See footnote 236. See also GOPALAN 1973:121-122.

[264] "We have already seen that the Ājīvika classification of the heavens was very different. Therefore, our attempts at reconstructing an Ājīvika pantheon must stop with Pūrṇabhadra, Maṇibhadra, and Brahma. Other gods there must have been, but we have no evidence of their names." See BASHAM 1951:274.

2.8 BHĀṬṬA MĪMĀṁSĀ SCHOOL[265]

There are two schools of Mīmāṁsā—Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṁsā and Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā—named after Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara, the founders of the respective schools. There are many minor differences between these two schools such as their epistemological differences in their definitions of perception and inference, but there are two important differences that are of interest to us.

The Bhāṭṭa school recognizes six *pramāṇa*s, while the Prābhākara school recognizes only five and does not recognize non-apprehension as a *pramāṇa*. The second difference relates to their definition of self. Both schools recognize the self to be different from the body, the sense organs, the mind, and the fleeting cognitions. The Bhāṭṭa school regards the self as self-illumined, or perceptible through mind, while the Prābhākara school does not regard it as an object of mental perception. For it, the self manifests as a knower in every act of perception of an object.

Aruṇanti focuses his attention on the Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṁsā school and discusses it in twenty-three verses while using just four verses to describe the Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā school.

The Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṁsika's claim that the Vedas do not have an author and they are uncaused (*svayambhu*) is criticized by the Śaiva Siddhāntin who asserts that things cannot arise on their own. There must be an efficient cause. For objects to be created out of earth and cotton, we should have potters and weavers.[266] Just because it was not witnessed, the authorship of the Vedas cannot be denied just as when we see clothes made in foreign lands we assume the existence of weavers although we have not seen them.[267] For the collection of words in the Vedas to be so meaningful and significant, there must be an intelligent source.

---

[265] See page 258 for translation of verses 181-203.

[266] "*…vētam cuyampu eṉa… kaṭāti paṭam vantiṭā oruvarā." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 194.*

[267] "*…āṭai palavāl varukiṉṟa vaḷarkiṉṟa tīvataṉil oru tantuvāyaṉ avaṉ ivaṉ eṉṟa pōtil nīṭi yavaiyē ivaiuḷa eṉṟu." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 196*.

Otherwise, there would be a cacophony of noises, like the roaring of the seas without any intelligent content.[268]

In attacking the Mīmāṁsika position that the souls possess knowledge without any help from god, the Śaiva Siddhāntin questions how the souls are attached to the bodily organs. The process needs an intelligent agent. Just as plants sprout from seeds in the rainy season and die in hot weather, the body also meets its death. Similarly, the world will perish, and it cannot be said to be eternal.[269] Extending the same line of thinking, the Siddhāntin argues: if the souls are omnipresent, then they cannot follow a virtuous path, enter heaven and be born again. On the other hand if the Mīmāṁsika says that the soul fills the body as the fragrance of a flower does, then just as the fragrance disappears when the flower wilts, so should the soul decay, as the body decays. The Mīmāṁsika is simply confused not to understand this.[270]

The Śaiva Siddhāntin also questions how past acts could reproduce themselves since the acts performed by a person die with the body. He scoffs at the metaphor used by the Mīmāṁsika that just as excrement can be turned into manure, which can offer nourishment to plants, so in the case of one body, the acts performed by the body cannot be reunited with the body in a future birth. The Śaiva Siddhāntin further states that just as laborers get paid in proportion to the amount of work done, only god can engage people in their karmic activities tailored to their actions. The Śaiva Siddhāntin also cautions and even criticizes the Mīmāṁsika that desire to perform sacrifices would push them towards more material acquisition, and desire to amass wealth could act as a deterrent and push them towards acquiring bad *karma*.[271]

---

[268] "*…uṇarviṉṟatu āḷi oliyē." Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 197.*

[269] "*…ulakeṉṟum pōyaḷiyumnīṭi yilatē." Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 200.*

[270] "*…malaikiṉṟatāl uṇ uraiyē." Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 201.*

[271] "*…pōkaviṇai purikiṉṟa vāṟatu vaḷar aviceṉṟu tiruniṉṟa pōkam mēviyatu celavuṇṭu cūḻva ceyalē." Civañāṇa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 203.*

2.9 PRĀBHĀKARA MĪMĀṀSĀ SCHOOL[272]

Aruṇanti summarizes the important aspects of the Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā school in one verse and offers the rebuttal in three verses. As he introduces the school, he states that there are differences between Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (Paṭṭāccāriyaṉ) and Prabhākara (Pirapākaraṉ) in their interpretation of Jaimini (Caimiṉi), the founder of the Mīmāṁsā school.

Aruṇanti points out that the views of the Prābhākara school are in opposition to Vedic injunctions. In verse 206, he ridicules them for their concept of *apūrva:* "To suggest that the fruits of *karma* are due to *apūrva,* and not due to the past *karma* defying the Vedic authority, is similar to suggesting that flowers picked from the sky get their fragrance when they are adorned (*tēṟiya viṇ pūcērntu maṇantu muṭimēl atuvām*)." In the same verse, Aruṇanti makes a sarcastic comment when he ridicules the Prābhākara school's position that ultimate liberation can be achieved when one loses intelligence and becomes an inert object like sand and stone. Would that position not suggest, Aruṇanti asks, that when one loses consciousness, one could attain salvation (*uṇarvu aṟintōrkku piṉ uḷatākum uyarmutti*).

In attacking the Prābhākara school, the Siddhāntin ridicules its concept of *apūrva*. The *apūrva* doctrine states that Vedic sacrifices produce happiness not here and now, but later in heaven. *Apūrva* is the unseen agency, which produces the fruition of the Vedic sacrificial acts posthumously. The deferred fruition of the performance of duties is due to the mediation of *apūrva*. In a sarcastic tone, the Siddhāntin compares *apūrva* to the flowers of the sky acquiring their fragrance after they were worn on the head. The Siddhāntin questions how the soul can enjoy bliss in salvation when the soul has no intelligence. This is comparable to saying that when a person faints he enjoys bliss. We all know that when fire is deprived of its heat it loses its identity but the claim that the soul can exist without its intelligence is comparable to that.

---

[272] See page 276 for translation of verses 204-207.

2.10 ŚABDA BRAHMAVĀDA SCHOOL[273]

The earliest reference to the concept of two Brahmans, one representing sound (*Śabdabrahman*) and the other not concerned with sound could be seen in the *Maitrī Upaniṣad*.[274] Scholars have different views on the relative merits of the two Brahmans.[275]

The concept of Śabda Brahman finds its most sophisticated development in the work of the grammarian Bhartṛhari according to whom the *Śabdabrahman* (the eternal verbum or word-essence) is the single principle and ultimate reality out of which the entire universe has evolved. Language and the universe it refers to are therefore one, an indivisible whole.[276] Bhartṛhari considers "*Śabdabrahman* to be the Absolute and the Divine." He holds that there is a unity of words and consciousness, which is the one ultimate reality. For Bhartṛhari, both the material and efficient cause of creation is Śabdabrahman.[277] "According to Bhartṛhari, the speech-principle has three stages in the course of its manifestation, namely *paśyantī*, *madhyamā,* and *vaikarī*. *Paśyantī* is the supreme Reality, Śabda Brahman, and has been identified with the *pratibhā*, the flash of insight or the principle of consciousness."[278]

---

[273] See page 279 for translation of verses 208-219.

[274] "athānyatrāpy uktam: dve vā va brahmaṇī abhidhyeye śabdaś cāśabdaśca, atha śabdenaivāśabdam āviṣkriyate, atha tatra aum iti." Maitrī Upaniṣad, 6.22 (quoted in Sanskrit)

"And thus it has been said elsewhere: 'There are, verily two Brahmans to be meditated upon, sound and non-sound. By sound alone is the non-sound revealed. Now here the sound is 'aum'." See RADHAKRISHNAN 1989:833.

[275] "The two [Śabdabrahman and Parabrahman] cannot also be regarded as the Ultimate Realities for the obvious reason that by doing so we strike at the root of monism which is the grammarians' philosophy. Therefore it must be admitted that any one of them is false while the other is the truth. And there is no room for doubt that Śabdabrahman is a fictitious principle for Parabrahman, as the very name suggests, is the Highest Reality. Hence Jayanta [Bhaṭṭa] boldly declares that the grammarians' conception of Śabdabrahman as the Ultimate Principle is hardly valid and should not deserve any serious attention." See SHASTRI 1939:453.

[276] JOHNSON 2009:55, 274.

[277] See COWARD 1997:150-151.

[278] RAJA 1977:147.

The Śabda Brahmavādins consider that because of delusion or mistaken identity, sound (*śabda*) appears as different objects of the universe (*uraiyāṉatu maiyaliṉāl ulakām*); they hold that those who consider the meaning of a word to be different from the sound are mistaken. On the other hand those who understand that *śabda* is Brahman are on their way to salvation (*poruḷpoy itaṉai viraiyātu uṇarum atu vīṭu eṉavē*).[279] It is *śabda* that manifests itself as the objects of the world. Just as a grain of rice can appear in several forms such as a grain or puffed rice (*poruḷ neṟporitāṉ eṉavē*), but the underlying property is the same, sound appears in different forms of the world, yet they are all products of sound (*poruḷoṉ ṟilaṇain tilatāl*).[280] The idea that the word and its meaning are successive is not satisfactory to the Śabda Brahmavādin, because that would suggest that a word and its meaning could exist independent of each other.[281]

The Śaiva Siddhāntin rejects the position and underlying assumption of the Śabda Brahmavādin about the relation of word and meaning. If the entire phenomenal world of objects were only the appearance of *śabda,* then *śabda* will be the source not only of its appearances, but also of the delusion, which causes the appearance. Sivaraman correctly points out that this will lead to infinite regress.[282] Furthermore, if the phenomenal world is nothing but the appearance of *śabda,* as there are multiple objects in the world, are there multiple *śabda*s? The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out the incongruence and states that a word (*śabda*) is simply a marker that indicates the object, but it is not identical with it. By saying the word "fire," one does not burn his mouth!

The Śaiva Siddhāntin holds that, just as a lamp throws light on an object in the dark (*arttam teḷitaṟku oḷiyāṉatupōl*), *śabda* provides meaning to a word (*cattam poruḷtāṉ aṟitaṟku uḷatām*). The *śabda* is not eternal, and its impermanence is evident because it is destroyed moments after generation. Śiva is the creator of

---

[279] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 208.*
[280] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 210.*
[281] *"collum poruḷiṉṟu colniṉṟatuvē.*
varaiyāturai vātivakuttaṉaṉē." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 211.
[282] See SIVARAMAN 1973:229.

the universe, including *śabda* (*cittaṉ oruvaṉ uraicey taṉaṉē*) and hence, *śabda* cannot be god.[283]

In dealing with the Śabda Brahmavāda school, Aruṇanti does not indulge in any polemic language, but strongly establishes his theistic position by denying the claim that the manifestation of the universe is due to *śabda,* and Śiva is alone the first cause.

[283] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 219*.

2.11 MĀYĀVĀDA SCHOOL[284]

Aruṇanti uses fifteen verses to introduce the tenets of the Māyāvāda school and eighteen verses to refute them.

In the Parapakkam, Aruṇanti has chosen to use the term Māyāvāda, instead of Advaita Vedānta, and we could only speculate about the reasons. It is possible that the poet was not totally familiar with the doctrines enunciated by Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara, and therefore he chose not to use their names. The other possibility is that around the thirteenth century, the Advaita school was not popular among Tamil-speaking, common people in South India, and they were not attracted by the highly Sanskritized tone of their treatises. However, it is difficult to totally subscribe to the second possibility because Aruṇanti uses, perhaps, the harshest language in attacking the Advaita system than any other school. This would suggest that perhaps Aruṇanti perceived a severe threat from Advaita and it was important for him to criticize the school so that the readers of the treatise would be dissuaded from switching their allegiance to Advaita. I have used the terms Māyāvāda, and Māyāvādins in my translation to conform to the original Tamil treatise, but in this section, I am using the term Advaita.

In his analysis of the Advaita system, Aruṇanti deals with the main principles of the school, including *māyā*, Brahman, soul or *jīva,* and liberation or *mutti*. He points out the incompatibilities between the Śaiva Siddhānta system and Advaita because of Advaita's inconsistent premises. The concept of *māyā* in Śaiva Siddhānta radically differs from that of Advaita Vedānta.[285] Advaitins consider *māyā* to be the transcendental illusion, in the sense of it being the cause of an illusory universe, except for Brahman.[286] The nature of *māyā* in Advaita is rather ambiguous because we cannot say that it exists, and also we cannot say that it

---

[284] See page 285 for translation of verses 220-252.

[285] See PANDIT 2010:77.

[286] [Everything is] illusory (*mittai*); the immutable eternal truth [unchanging Brahman] (*avikāram paramārtam*) that contains the universe (*cakamum koḷḷatāl*) will [always] shine (*kulavu*). *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 224.*

does not exist. Śaiva Siddhānta on the other hand, in its theological perspective, treats *māyā* in a positive sense that it is not relegated to the realm of ambiguity. Śaiva Siddhāntins consider that *māyā* is basically an eternal substance or power of Siva, and it is out of this substance, which Siva lets the universe to be born and into which, it is resolved or dissolved. It is real and eternal; it is in the form of energy.[287] Unlike Advaita, which considers the creation of the universe is just a sport (*līlā* in Sanskrit and *līlai* in Tamil) for Īśvara, Śaiva Siddhānta considers the five actions of Śiva to be purposeful and deliberate.[288]

Let me provide some examples of the pejorative language used and dismissive attitude displayed by Aruṇanti in his analysis of the Advaita system. He begins his introduction of Advaita by calling the Advaitin (Māyāvādin) (*māyāvāti*) a shameless (*māṉā*) and devilish (*pēyāki*) individual with an impaired intellect (*matikē ṭaṉumāya*), who calls himself Brahman (*nāṉē piramam eṉṟuraittu*).[289] When criticizing the Advaitin for proclaiming unity with Brahman, the Śaiva Siddhāntin calls him to be delusional (*mōkamāṉa urai*)) and his statement to be as ridiculous as saying that a barren crow (*malaṭu ākiya kākam āṉatu*) picks some meat from a black rock (*karuṅkaliṉ tacai paṟitta*) to feed its young (*kuñciyiṉ vāyiṭai koṭuttatu*).[290] In chiding the Advaitin for his lack of comprehension, he blames him for searching the existence of a hare's horn (*nī muyaliṉ kōṭu nāṭiṉāy*).[291] In one verse, he rejects the Advaitin's claim by saying that his position is defeated (*ōṭum ākum*) and his words are defective (*ōtum ivai ūṉamāki*) and they suggest contrary meanings (*urai māṟukōḷ kūṭu mākum*).[292]

Just as he has done in attacking other schools, Aruṇanti cleverly sets up a "straw man." When the Advaitin used a simile about a man mistaking a rope for a

---

[287] Brahman creates the entire phenomenal world (*vaiyam ellām taṉpakkal ōṅka utippittu*), sustains it (*niṟutti*), and [eventually], at the end, (*oṭukkattu*) dissolves it (*ilatākkum*). All activities (*āṅku vanta vāṟu ellām*) in this world (*cakattiṉ*) are fittingly (*ataṉāl amaivu*) due to his power (*cattām*). *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 225.*

[288] See footnote 5.

[289] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 220.*

[290] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 235.*

[291] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 238.*

[292] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 236.*

snake in the dark and was frightened, the Śaiva Siddhāntin states that such a person undergoing delusion (*appirāntiyuṭaiyōrum*)) must also be part of the all-pervading Brahman (*appirama pētamāy niṟpar*)). This means delusion is inherent to Brahman. He then ridicules the idea of worshipping delusion hoping to attain salvation (*iṉpatu atu ilātatām*).[293] If the Advaitin claims that the appearance of the universe is similar to the silk from a spider (*cilampi vāyiṉ iṭai vanta vāṟu*)) and Brahman acts just as a witness (*attuṭaṉ nilātu eṉṟupiṉ*), then the Siddhāntin says the Advaitin is foolish (*pēyaṉē*) to suggest that an earthen pot (*kaṭam miruttil vantatu*) appears by itself (*piṟappatu āvatilai*).[294]

The Advaitin had stated that Brahman is omnipresent. If that were so, the Śaiva Siddhāntin asks if Brahman is attached to unconsciousness and even dead bodies. If the answer is yes, then Brahman is intellectually challenged (*piramam īṟu tāṉ iva*), with inactive senses (*uṭaiyatāya tō eṉkolō*) or perhaps even his senses are dead (*iṟappatē*).[295]

In the last verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin belittles the Advaitin by saying that the real significance of one of the supposedly "great sayings"[296] of his school "*tat tvam asi*" (*āraṇaṅkaḷ tattuvam aci*) is beyond comprehension even for Viṣṇu and Brahmā (*nāraṇaṉ pirama ṉālum*). Only those who worship Śiva's feet (*nāyakaṉ kaḻalkaḷ naṇṇi nī*)) and follow the yogic and knowledge paths (*yōka ñāṉamum iyaṟṟiṭē*) will understand the real meaning and attain salvation.[297]

---

[293] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 240*.
[294] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 243*.
[295] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 244.*
[296] See footnote 490.
[297] *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 244.*

2.12 BHĀSKARA SCHOOL[298]

Bhāskara or Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara as he is referred to in several treatises, composed his work on Bhedābheda ("[the doctrine of] identity in difference") in the early part of the eighth century.[299] The main object of his philosophy from the negative point of view was his condemnation of *māyāvāda.*

The Bhāskara school agrees with the Māyāvādin about the revealed nature of the Vedas. Bhāskara also holds that souls are real, because they are manifestations of Brahman.

The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out the untenable logic that Brahman can become both matter and something other than matter. If one Bhāskarin were to suggest that Brahman is part of the phenomenal world just as salt is part of seawater, the analogy is not acceptable because the natures of salt and water are quite different. Should the claim be that only a part of Brahman forms the world, then it suggests that Brahman is perishable. It leads to the conclusion that Brahman is not immutable. If one could enjoy bliss of union with Brahman in his human form, the Bhāskarin is asked what would be the motivation for people to undergo pain and self-mortification.

Finally, with an abrasive tone the Śaiva Siddhāntin attacks the Bhāskarin by ridiculing his concept that the evolution of the world is comparable to the evolution of a tree from a seed. The tree gets nourishment from the soil, but where does Brahman get its nourishment? He closes the argument by saying that the Bhāskarin's delusional words are as insane as the Brahman (*piramam āyiṉāy ulaku pittaṉ eṉrū ivai pitaṟṟiyē*).

---

[298] See page 309 for translation of verses 253-259.

[299] Bhāskara (circa 8th century CE) was a near contemporary of Śaṅkara, but disagreed with his brand of Advaita. He maintained, instead, a *bhedābheda* stance holding that the world is one, but its diversity is real. See JOHNSON 2009:56.

2.13 NIRĪŚVARA SĀṀKHYA SCHOOL [300]

Aruṇanti summarizes the important aspects of the school in one verse and offers the rebuttal in three verses. *Puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are the two ultimate realities, which are independent of each other. *Puruṣa* is the conscious principle whereas *prakṛti* is the eternal, unconscious principle and the ultimate cause of the world. *Prakṛti* divides itself into *mūlam* (root), *puriyaṭṭakam* (subtle body), and *vikirti* (gross body as well as the universe).

Aruṇanti points out that if *puruṣa'*s nature is pure intelligence, then *prakṛti* can never cover it. That means the bondage between the two is unintelligible. Furthermore, how could a liberated soul prevent being covered by *prakṛti* again? According to Aruṇanti, there is no *prakṛti* to be witnessed by a liberated *puruṣa,* and hence the question of witnessing *prakṛti* is a moot point. *Puruṣa* loses part of its intelligence by the union with *prakṛti.* Together, they move slowly, just as a lame person piggybacks on a blind person (*kuruṭaṉ mutukil mūṭavaṉ iruntu*). However, this cannot take place without Śiva's guidance.

In the last verse, Aruṇanti reiterates that Śiva is the prime force behind the activities of both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti.* Just as Śiva brought about the union between the two, he is the one who could show his grace and separate the two (*cērttōṉ vēṇṭum ceyaliṟpōm*) by liberating the soul to attain salvation.

[300] See page 314 for translation of verses 260-263.

2.14 PĀÑCARĀTRA SCHOOL[301]

The Āgama tradition, over time, branched off into three schools—Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva, and Śākta with their respective presiding deities of Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa, Śiva and Śakti. They are identified as the three great sectarian streams in medieval and later Hinduism. The Vaiṣṇava Āgamas also became branched into two, under the names Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra.[302] The Pāñcarātra Āgamas are supposedly based on the "Ekāyana" recensions of Vedic origin. The fact that Aruṇanti has chosen the Pāñcarātra Āgamas to examine and formulate its principles gives us a clue that during his period this tradition was perhaps more in vogue compared to the Vaikhānasa tradition.

Aruṇanti uses seven verses to describe the basic tenets of the school and uses thirty-one verses to appraise the validity of those principles.

There are several theories about the name Pāñcarātra, and how the school got its name.[303] The name has, according to some scholars, its origins in a particular class of Āgama texts from which the school derives its ritual traditions. There is a suggestion that the prefix *Pāñca* or five relates to the five doctrines of the school.[304] However, according to Srinivasa Chari, one plausible interpretation is provided by Vedānta Deśikā who states that the name is derived from the fivefold daily religious duty of a Vaiṣṇava.[305] It is very difficult to say why the

---

[301] See page 317 for translation of verses 264-301.

[302] A note on the terminology. "Both the system and its followers are usually called *Pāñcarātra*, but for the system the name *Pañcarātra*, and for its followers *Pañcarātrin* (*Pāñcarātrika*) are also used." See SCHRADER 1973:3. I use Pāñcarātra (not italicized) to indicate the school/system, and Pāñcarātrin (not italicized) to indicate the follower of the system.

[303] "Refers to a religious system followed by the Bhāgavatas; the religious treatise dealing with modes of worship of God and matters relating to temples." See CHARI 2005:354.

[304] Pazha Muttappan has a different theory and suggests the name is because Vācutēvaṉ [Viṣṇu] imparted the Āgamic knowledge to five celestials (Aṉantaṉ, Karuṭaṉ, Viṭuvaccēṉaṉ, Kapāli, and Piramaṉ) in five days. See MUTTAPPAN 2003:207.

[305] "The *Pāñcarātra Saṁhitās* have divided the day into five parts and laid down a specific religious routine to be observed by a devoted Vaiṣṇava at each time of the day. This fivefold religious routine is known as *pañcakāla-prakriyā*. This comprises [in Sanskrit]: (1) *abhigamana* or morning prayer, (2) *upādāna* or collection of the requisite materials for worship, (3) *ijyā* or formal

name Pāñcarātra is given to the school. Bhatt offers as many as eight plausible origins of this word. One thing, however, is certain that the school has something to do with five "*rātra*s," but what these five *rātra*s are, is now merely a matter of conjecture.[306]

Viśiṣṭādvaita accepts the Pāñcarātra as authoritative temple ritual. Some of the important tenets of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism such as the conception of the four *vyūha*s[307] seem to have been adopted from the Pāñcarātra Āgamas.[308] In tracing the origins of the Pāñcarātra literature Alexis Sanderson makes some important observations.[309]

The teachings of the Pāñcarātra school closely follow the pattern of all Āgama literature, which generally fall into four sections, according to the four main themes treated, which are as follows: Jñāna, Yoga, Kriyā, and Caryā. However, we note the time-honored controversy concerning the relation between the Vedic and the Pāñcarātra teachings. The discussion centers on the question if the Pāñcarātra is Vedic or non-Vedic in origin, and if the doctrines of the school are pro-Vedic or anti-Vedic.[310] Bhatt concludes that the early Pāñcarātra prescriptions were not favored by the Brahmanic tradition. Because the teachings were considered anti-Vedic, they were condemned and denigrated. Later on, when the school went through a transformation, and amended its doctrines and

---

worship of god (4) *svādyāya* or recitation and study of sacred texts, and (5) *yoga* or contemplation on God." See CHARI 2005:311.

[306] See BHATT 1980:2-5.

[307] "One of the five [?] incarnations of the Supreme Being; the four divine manifestations as Vāsudeva, Saṁkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha." See CHARI 2005:363.

[308] "According to Sri Ramanuja, (1) the texts of the Pancharatras controvert the doctrine of the origination of jiva, (2) the Pancharatra Agamas are not opposed to the teachings of the Veda, and (3) none but the highest Brahman abides in the four vyūhas." See ADIDEVANANDA 1974:224.

[309] In Sanderson's opinion, that new literature of the scriptural texts collectively known as the Pañcarātra, and was probably composed in and around Kashmir. "A form of Vaiṣṇavism bearing this name is already mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*. It is very probable, therefore, that it was in existence well before the Śaiva Mantramārga." One of his conclusions states that "…early Pañcarātra texts show clear signs of having drawn on Śaiva sources. This is particularly obvious in the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* […]." See SANDERSON 2009:58-65. Other scholars have also resonated with this idea. See also GUPTA 1992:176-177. BHATT 1966:57.

[310] For a good analysis, see BHATT 1980:11-13.

practices, it gained a place under Vedic authority, but that was always kept as inferior.[311]

The Pāñcarātra theology holds that Viṣṇu is instrumental in creating the world and is responsible for the triple role of creation, maintenance, and dissolution. Worshipping Viṣṇu alone would lead one to salvation by removing the effects caused by *māyā.* The Śaiva Siddhāntin contradicts the Pāñcarātrin and states that the Vedas were, in fact, revealed by Śiva, and not by Viṣṇu as advocated by the Pāñcarātrin. The Śaiva Siddhāntin also chides the Pāñcarātrin to get rid of his confusion and understand (*tiyaṅkiṭātu uṇarāy*) that everything happening in the universe is due to the will of Śiva.[312]

He further points out the contradiction in the Pāñcarātrin position that Brahmā created Viṣṇu, and Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) created Brahmā.[313] The Pāñcarātrin is questioned about the morality of Viṣṇu when he appeared as Kṛṣṇa exhorting Arjuna to kill his relatives,[314] how could he justify the atheistic teachings of the Buddha in another incarnation. The Āgamas assert that when the souls annul their impurities they achieve liberation and unite with Śiva. On the contrary, the Pāñcarātrin believes that Viṣṇu will assume the role of *māyā* and will become the ignorant soul.[315] The Śaiva Siddhāntin uses harsh language in rebuking the Pāñcarātrin and states knowledgeable people will not give any credence to such views and would not accept defective treatises, which have opinions contrary to those of the Āgamas.[316] The Śaiva Siddhāntin in the final verse of the treatise concludes by saying that Viṣṇu is not without impurity, and is not the Supreme god. Hence, the Pāñcarātrin should adore and worship the feet of Śiva, the Lord of the Universe.

---

[311] See BHATT 1980:13.

[312] *"…tiyaṅkiṭātu uṇarāy ellām civaṉceyal eṉṟu tērntē." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 275.*

[313] *"nāraṇaṉ ayaṉai īṉṟum ayaṉum nāraṇaṉai īṉṟum…" Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 277.*

[314] *"pārttaṉār iratam eṟip paṭaitaṉaip pārttuc cārpaik*
kūrttaam pālē eytu koṉṟu ara cāḷēṉ…" Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 293.

[315] "*…māyaiyum uṟuvaṉ eṉṉil…" Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 295.*

[316] Wise people (*nallōr*) would disdain (*kūci*) and refuse (*piṉ koḷḷār*) your confusing treatise (*uṉakkām ik kuḻappu nūlē*). *Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 295*.

The Śaiva Siddhāntin analyzes the ten incarnations[317] of Viṣṇu and systematically demonstrates with examples and details that how in each incarnation, Śiva was involved either to save Viṣṇu or to extricate him from a difficult situation. Aruṇanti displays his extensive knowledge of the Purāṇic accounts and sets up his counter arguments in a masterly fashion.

[317] *daśāvatārāḥ* in Sanskrit and *tacāvatāraṅkaḷ* in Tamil. Schrader has an interesting comment on the "incarnations." "It is, indeed, for meditation more than anything else that Viṣṇu is believed to have manifested himself under different forms." See SCHRADER 1973:57.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

In this dissertation, I have provided a critical analysis of the *Parapakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*. My analysis includes a translation of the three-hundred-and-one verses from medieval Tamil to English. To examine the nature of the treatise, I established a framework with parameters for what might be considered a polemic treatise. Then, I analyzed the text to assess if the *Parapakkam* meets all the criteria established.[318]

In his treatise, Aruṇanti displays his familiarity with many other systems of philosophy, albeit limited in certain cases. When he begins his scrutiny of each school, usually in the first verse, he offers a synopsis of the school including the most salient point of the school. For example, when he introduces the Lokāyata, he highlights its atheistic nature, besides its materialistic tendencies. Similarly, when he introduces Vaiṣṇavism, he states the two important divisions in the nascent stage of the school, Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra. When he addresses Buddhism, he states that there are four main divisions within the Buddhist tradition and then proceeds to concentrate on the Sautrāntikas. After setting up the framework for a particular school, he uses several verses to discuss its principal tenets.

His treatment of the schools, however, is not uniform, and he does not offer the same amount of detail for all schools. The distribution of verses among the fourteen schools is shown in Appendix 1. Does Aruṇanti handle all systems fairly and even-handedly or does he show any bias? He does seem to favor some for extensive analysis, and some others are examined marginally, at best. The reasons are not clear. Although Aruṇanti demonstrates considerable knowledge about the principal tenets of competing schools, by no means could it be construed as exhaustive and thorough. As pointed out in this thesis, on a few occasions he falters and reveals his weakness.

---

[318] See section 1.7, page 50 for a description of the technical terms.

One thing that strikes the reader is the importance given to the Sautrāntika school and the paltry treatment meted out to the other three Buddhist schools. When he addresses the Jaina school, he focuses on the Digambaras and completely ignores the Śvetāmbaras. This suggests to me that in the Tamil country during the thirteenth century CE, the principal sect of the Jaina schools must have been the Digambaras. My conjecture is further strengthened as Aruṇanti calls them Nigaṇḍavādins, the name by which the Jains (Digambaras) were called during that period. Jainism experienced a split when many supporters of Vardhamāna changed allegiance and followed Makkhali Gosāla, forming a new school, the Ājīvikas. The fact that Aruṇanti treats the Ājīvika school on its own merit suggests to me that the school was still a vibrant one to be reckoned with in the thirteenth century CE. It is evident that Aruṇanti was dealing only with those schools that were prevalent during his day and he wrote about them from his own perspective and knowledge.

The Pāñcarātra is the last major school in his analysis (judged by the number of verses) of the fourteen schools dealt with in the *Parapakkam*. We observe immediately that Aruṇanti's analysis of the Pāñcarātra is skewed. He focuses entirely on the *Purāṇic* stories common to Vaiṣṇava tradition and totally ignores its important theological doctrines. Again, we could offer our conjecture. Rāmānuja lived in the eleventh century, and as the doctrines advocated by him were becoming popular among the masses, perhaps they had not gained enough prominence over the prevailing popular *Purāṇic* renditions in Aruṇanti's period. Furthermore, there was no incentive for Aruṇanti to delve deeper into the Vaiṣṇava doctrines because in the Tamil country, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, both Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism were equally popular with almost similar following. It was a period after the Āḻvārs and Nāyaṉmār had established their respective traditions, and both traditions were enjoying equal popularity. As an advocate of the Śaiva faith, Aruṇanti was not under any pressure to usurp the Vaiṣṇava faith nor did he anticipate any threat from it.

Aruṇanti addresses only the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā school to the exclusion of Uttara Mīmāṁsā (Vedānta). Perhaps, during his period, Vedānta was not a popular faith

among the masses, as the school did not have much to offer in the area of *bhakti*. It is significant to note that Aruṇanti does not use the name "Pūrva Mīmāṁsā," and instead uses the names of the two major subdivisions, the Kumārila Bhaṭṭa school, and the Prābhākara school. It is likely that these two names were used taking into account their differences.

From the above observations, we could conclude that Aruṇanti was basing his writings purely on his personal knowledge rather than from textual sources. This leads us into another aspect of Aruṇanti's style in handling the discussion. The language used in the arguments marshaled by him appears as though they are spoken in face-to-face debates.[319]

The *modus operandi* of Aruṇanti appears to be that he would choose only those principles representing a school, which he could easily attack and dismantle. His selection and description of the sensual pleasures acceptable to the Lokāyata school is a prime example. He identifies the vulnerable points of the opposing schools, which would be good targets to attack. For example, while addressing the Mādhyamika school, in one verse, he takes the Buddhist principle of "no-soul" (*anātman*) and with his Śaiva principle that recognizes soul as an eternal entity, uses the next two verses to attack the Buddhist school and reiterates his own position. Similarly, as stated earlier, and which is worth repeating, while addressing the Pañcarātra system, the details Aruṇanti seems to recognize about the school are the Purāṇic accounts, especially those stories about which god is supreme.

---

[319] For example*, "iṉpam eyti iruntu nīviṉai illai iṅkuiyalpu eṉṟiṭil tuṉpam eytiṭu vāṉeṉ maṟṟitu colliṭāy." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 49.*

"You enjoy the pleasures of this world and still you say that it is not the karmic law, but it is the nature of the world. [If that is so], what is the reason for anyone to experience pain? Do not tell me otherwise." (My translation).

"*puttanī aṟiyāta eṉṟu iṅku aṟaintāy…" Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 95.*

"You Buddhist! Due to [your] ignorance you said […]." (My translation).

"*pōtamum tavira vēṟuōr vātaṉai pukaṉṟāy pōtam vātaṉai iraṇṭu uṇṭu eṉṉāy." Civañāṉa Cittiyār, Parapakkam 136.*

"You declared that besides intelligence there are impressions [from previous birth]. You did not say that intelligence and impressions are two different [things]." (My translation).

Examining Aruṇanti as a poet is very rewarding. There are several exquisite examples of rhyming, alliteration, and metaphors. The metaphors are used to embellish positions of both protagonist and antagonist. The poet does find many opportunities to employ his metaphors in denigrating the position of the opposing school, sometimes with humor and often with sarcasm and even contempt. Most of them are pointed out in my analysis.

At this stage, it is worth remembering that a “polemic” work need not imply a negative connotation. A fair polemic treatise offers philosophical refutations from a particular perspective, and arguments are presented systematically without any hostile undertones. An unfair polemic treatise offers unmerited criticism, ad hominem attacks, and sarcastic rhetoric. Good polemics offers serious and sustained refutation whereas bad polemics engages in little significant argumentation and plenty of rhetoric. Another aspect to remember about polemical literature is that most polemic treatises are not totally analytical or totally hostile. Usually they are a mixture of both extremes, and what determines the classification is the tone that predominates. I find that Aruṇanti while offering serious philosophical refutations, occasionally lapses into sarcasm, which moves him from polemics of critical refutation to polemics of unfair ad hominem arguments, and cavil. Thus his work, in my view, falls in line with many other philosophers of the times.

Aruṇanti’s work is probably using many common refutations of specific schools. Many of his arguments are philosophical refutation according debates of the times. Only when this text is compared to, similar antecedent compendiums in detail like the *Sarva darśana saṁgraha*, the *Ṣad darśana samuccaya*, and the *Sarva siddhānta saṅgraha*, or refutation of particular schools within individual philosophical treatises, will one be able to determine how much Aruṇanti has borrowed and what is original to him. Such an analysis is beyond the scope of this thesis.

I find that in composing the *Parapakkam*, Aruṇanti has established a style of his own in setting up what I call a polemic treatise. He varies his style from a serious examination of a metaphysical point to sarcastic attack with harsh and

abrasive language to refute a theological position of the opposing school. The culminating point for him is to establish that Śaiva Siddhānta is superior to all other schools and Śiva is the ultimate protector and savior. Worshipping him is the only way to unite with him and attain salvation.

In achieving his goal, Aruṇanti has provided a delightful treatise, and one could say that any reader of the *Parapakkam* of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* will enjoy the journey. I certainly did.

4.0 TRANSLATION[320]

4.0 INVOCATORY DEDICATIONS (VERSES 1-11)

VERSE 1

orukōṭṭaṉ iruceviyaṉ mummatattaṉ
nālvāyaiṅ karattaṉ āṟu
tarukōṭṭam piṟaiitaḷit tāḻcaṭaiyāṉ
tarumoruvā raṇattiṉ tāḷkaḷ
urukōṭṭuaṉ poṭum vaṇaṅki ōvātē
iravupakal uṇarvōr cintait
tirukuōṭṭum ayaṉ tirumāl celvamumoṉ
ṟōeṉṉac ceyyum tēvē.

[It is customary for poets to begin with an invocation of deities (*teyvaṅkaḷ*) at the commencement of a poem to facilitate its successful completion (*kāppu*). This invocatory verse praises the deity Gaṇapati, one who protects his followers from all obstacles in their endeavors].

TRANSLATION:

With the river Ganges (*āṟu*), crescent of the moon (*piṟai*), and a garland of cassia flowers (*itaḷ*), all three adorning his braided hair (*tāḻcaṭaiyāṉ*), Śiva [is] the father of the single-tusked one (*orukōṭṭaṉ*)[321], the two-eared one (*iruceviyaṉ*), the one with three secretions (*mummatattaṉ*),[322] the one with a drooping mouth (*nālvāy*) [jaw], the one with five hands (*aiṅ karattaṉ*)[323] and the one who is elephant-faced

---

[320] See footnote 181 for an explanation of the "protagonist-antogonist" genre of philosophical debates. The *Parapakkam* follows that genre.

[321] There are two *Purāṇic* stories as to how the elephant-headed Gaṇeśa lost one of his tusks. One story relates to his encounter with Paraśurāma. Gaṇeśa was guarding his father Śiva who was asleep. When he refused to let Paraśurāma enter his father's abode, a scuffle broke out and Gaṇeśa lost his tusk in the fight that ensued. The second story alludes to how Gaṇeśa used his tusk as a scribe to write the Mahābhārata at the behest of the sage Vyāsa.

[322] An elephant in the rut has three different kinds of secretions from three different parts of the body (*kaṉṉa-matam*, *kai-matam* and *kōca-matam*).

[323] Four hands and the trunk.

(*vāraṇattiṉ*) [Gaṇapati]. If one worships his revered feet (*tāḷkaḷ*) with a tender heart and love (*urukōṭṭaṉ poṭum vaṇaṅki*), and night and day (*iravupakal*) without interruption (*ovātē*), they will drive away (*tirukōṭṭum*) [remove] the ignorance from the worshipper's mind (*cintai*). [Furthermore, the worshipper will be blessed with joy and pleasure] to make him doubt if Brahmā and Viṣṇu (*ayaṉ tirumāl*) could ever offer such a delight (*celvamum oṉṟō eṉṉa*).[324]

VERSE 2

ātinaṭu antam ilā aḷavil cōti
aruḷñāṉa mūrttiyāy akilam īṉṟa
mātiṉaiyum orupākattu aṭakki vāṉōr
makuṭacū ḷāmaṇiyāy vaiyam pōṟṟap
pātimati aṇipavaḷac caṭaikaḷ tāḻap
paṭaroḷiam palattuāṭum paraṉār pātat
tātumali tāmaraikaḷ cirattē vaittut
taḷarāta pēraṉpu vaḷarā niṟpām.

[In this verse, the poet pays obeisance to Lord Śiva].

TRANSLATION:

Without a beginning, nor a middle, nor an end (*ātinaṭu antamilā*), providing limitless [unknowable] brilliance (*aḷavil cōti*)[325] with the divine grace of knowledge as his body (*aruḷñāṉa mūrttiyāy*), merging with the lady on his [left] side (*mātiṉaiyum orupākat taṭakki*) who produced the entire universe (*akilam īṉṟa*), appearing before the [celestial] *devas* (*vāṉōr*) as the crown jewel (*makuṭa cūḷāmaṇiyāy*), adorning the half-moon crescent (*pātimati*) on his head that is

[324] The poet has cleverly used the numerals one to six to represent different things, not necessarily for a numerical measure. For example, *nāl (ku*) means the numeral four, and *nālvāy* is also an epithet for Gaṇapati. Similarly, *āṟu* means the numeral six as well as a river.

[325] The unknowable brilliance (*aḷavil cōti*) suggests that although Śiva pervades the entire universe, he cannot be contained in human perception. *Aḷavil* refers to "unknowability."

praised by the world (*vaiyam pōr̲ra*), with his shining coral braids (*paṭaroḷi pavaḷac caṭaikaḷ*) falling behind him (*tāl̲a*), it is Siva (*paraṉār*) who dances in Ampalam (*ampalattu āṭum*)[326]; [let us] keep his lotus feet full of fragrant pollen (*tātumali tāmaraikaḷ*) on our heads (*cirattē vaittu*) and worship him for a continuous growth (*vaḷarā*) of tireless (*taḷarāta*) [perpetual] enjoyment of divine love (*pēraṉpu*).

VERSE 3

īcaṉ aruḷ iccai ar̲ivu iyar̲r̲al iṉpam
ilayamoṭu pōkamati kāram ākit
tēcuaruvam aruvuruvam uruvamākit
tēviyumāyt tēcamoṭu celva mākip
pēcariya uyiraiyelām per̲r̲u nōkkip
perumpōkam avaiyaḷittup pir̲appiṉaiyum ol̲littiṭṭu
ācuakalum aṭiyaruḷattu appaṉuṭaṉ irukkum
aṉṉai aruṭ pātamalar ceṉṉi vaippām.

[This verse pays obeisance to Śiva-Śakti. The role of Śakti (goddess) and her being instrumental in all the sacred sports (*līlai*) and amorous acts of Śiva is emphasized].

TRANSLATION:

Śakti appears as Śiva's grace (*īcaṉ aruḷ*). She appears as *iccācatti* (*iccai*),

---

[326] *Ampalam* refers to the Śaiva shrine at Citamparam. Two of Śiva's names *ampalakkūttaṉ* and *ampalavāṇaṉ* refer to the dancing Śiva at Citamparam and Śiva as the presiding deity at Citamparam, respectively. Citamparam is often treated as the lynchpin in Tamil Śaiva mythology. Many Tamil *Purāṇic* accounts such as the *Citamparapurāṇam*, the *Kōyir̲purāṇam*, the *Tiruppuliyūrpurāṇam*, and the *Capānātapurāṇam* refer to Citamparam as the first and foremost holy citadel of the Śaiva faith. See MUDALIAR 1988:636-637.

In the *Periya Purāṇam,* the hagiographies of the Nāyaṉmār also have references to the holy shrine at Citamparam and the cosmic dance of Śiva taking place at that shrine. See VANMIKANATHAN 1985:46, 48, 140, 168, and 378.

ñāṉacatti (*aṟivu*), *kiriyācatti* (*iyaṟṟal*)[327] and for his pleasure (*iṉpam*). She manifests herself as dissolution (*ilayam*), sustenance (*pōkam*) and creation (*atikāram āki*)[328]. She appears as part of Śiva's three states of being without form (*aruvam*), with form (*uruvamāki*), and both with form and without form (*aruvuruvam*). She appears as Śiva's glorious (*tēcu*) consort (*tēviyumāy*), and as the manifested world (*ēcamoṭu*) with all its wealth (*celvam āki*). Facilitating [the devotees] countless lives (*pēcariya uyiraiy elām*) to be born (*peṟṟu*),[329] protecting them (*nōkki*), providing them immense joy (*perumpōkam avaiyaḷittu*) and when the impurities are removed (*ācu akalum*)[330] she lives with Śiva (*appaṉuṭaṉ irukkum*) in their minds (*aṭiyar uḷattu*), removing future births (*piṟappiṉaiyum oḻittiṭṭu*). Let us keep that mother's graceful lotus feet (*aṉṉai aruṭ pātamalar*) on our heads (*ceṉṉi vaippām*).

VERSE 4

iyampunūl iruntamiḻiṉ ceyyuḷ āṟṟāl
iṭaiyūṟu tīrntuiṉitu muṭiya vēṇṭit
tayaṅkupēr oḷiyāki eṅkum niṉṟa
talaivaṉār malaimātu taṉṉōṭu āṭip
payantaaiṅ karamnāṟṟōḷ mukkaṇ iru pātap
pariyatu oru nīḷkōṭṭup periya paṇṭik
kayamtaṉ aṭik kamalaṅkaḷ nayantu pōṟṟik

---

[327] They represent Śiva's desiring power, Śiva's knowing power, and Śiva's power to act, respectively. The Sanskrit equivalents are *icchā-Śakti*, *jñāna-Śakti*, and *kriyā-Śakti*.

[328] Ilayam, atikaram and pokam refer to three states of avattai, where knowledge is predominant, action is predominant or they both are balanced. The Tamil word avattai (avasthā-Sanskrit) has several meanings, and in the context of Śaiva Siddhānta it represents the three aspects of Śiva. The soul undergoes changes depending on its spiritual maturity. The soul progresses from the state of total inactivity *(kēvala avattai*), to a state, where the soul is inseparable from the body (*cakala avattai*), and finally to the pure state (*cutta avattai*). The equivalent Sanskrit words are *kevala-avasthā*, *sakala-avasthā*, and *śuddhāvasthā*.

[329] According to the Śaiva Siddhānta, Māyā is the material cause of the phenomenal world, Śakti is the instrumental cause, and Śiva himself is the efficient cause. See PIET 1952:53..

[330] In Śaiva Siddhānta, ācu is one of the impurities *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "āṇavamalam" (p. 213)*.

karuttiluṟa iruttimikak kātal ceyvām.

[This verse continues the theme of the first verse and reiterates the poet's obeisance to Vināyaka and his prayer for protection from impediments. Although both the names Gaṇapati and Vināyaka refer to the same deity—Śiva's son—Aruṇanti offers his obeisance to Gaṇapati in the first verse and offers his obeisance to Vināyaka in the fourth verse].

TRANSLATION:

Appearing everywhere (*eṅkum niṉṟa*) as a brilliant light (*tayaṅkupēr oḷiyāki*),god (*talaivaṉār*), and out of his union (*taṉṉōṭu āṭip payanta*) with his consort "his wife of the Mountain" (*malaimātu*) [Umai][331] [was born][332] with five hands (*aiṅkaram*), four shoulders (*nāṟṟōḷ*), three eyes (*mukkaṇ*), two feet (*iru pāta*), a long single tusk (*oru nīḷkōṭṭu*), a big stomach (*periya paṇṭi*), and an elephant face (*kayamtaṉ*). To accomplish (*āṟṟāl*) the present work (*iyampunūl*), a poetic composition (*ceyyuḷ*) in the great Tamil language (*iruntamiḻ*), resolving all obstacles (*iṭaiyūṟu tīrntu*), [and] requesting (*vēṇṭi*) a successful completion (*iṉitu muṭiya*), let us worship his lotus feet (*aṭik kamalaṅkaḷ*), yearn for (*nayantu*) and praise him (*pōṟṟi*), holding him (*irutti*) in concentration (*karuttil uṟa*) with immense love (*mikak kātal ceyvām*).

VERSE 5

arumaṟai ākamam aṅkam aruṅkalainūl terinta
akattiyaṉukku ottuuraikkum aruṭkuruvām kuruḷai
tirumaṟaimā muṉivarmuṉi tēvarkaḷtam tēvaṉ
Civaṉ aruḷcēr tirumatalai tavanilaiyōr teyvam
porumaṟaiyār kaḻalvīrar vīraṉ kaiyil
pūnīrkoṇṭu ōvātu pōṟṟum aṭiyārkaḷ

---

[331] Umai (Umā Sanskrit) is the daughter of Himavat and Menā, and wife of Śiva.
[332] Gaṇapati or Vināyaka is the son of Śiva and Umai.

karumaṟaiyā vakaiaruḷik kativaḻaṅkum kantaṉ
kaḻaliṇaikaḷ emcirattil karuttil vaippām.

[This verse pays obeisance to Murukaṉ, the son of Śiva].

TRANSLATION:

By the grace of Śiva, Murukaṉ appeared as his son (*Civaṉ aruḷcēr tirumatalai*). He appeared as a young (*kuruḷai*) knowledgeable teacher (*aruṭkuruvām*) to teach (*ottuuraikkum*) the real significance of the Vedas (*arumaṟai*), the Āgamas (*ākamam*), the *vētāṅka*s (*aṅkam*)[333] and treatises on arts and science (*aruṅkalainūl*)[334] to the sage Agastyar (*akattiyaṉukku*) who was knowledgeable (*terinta*) in all these. He [Murukaṉ] is the sage of all sages who had mastered the Vedas (*tirumaṟai mā muṉivarmuṉi*), god of all gods (*tēvarkaḷtam tēvaṉ*), god of the ascetics (*tavanilaiyōr teyvam*), and hero of all the heroes who wear the anklets of heroism[335] (*porumaṟaiyār kaḻalvīrar vīraṉ*). To those followers (*aṭiyārkaḷ*) who constantly worship him (*ōvātu pōṟṟum*) and bring him flowers and water (*kaiyil pū nīr koṇṭu*), Murukaṉ (*kantaṉ*) will enter their wombs to prevent future births (*karumaṟaiyā vakaiaruḷi*) and provide release (*kativaḻaṅkum*). Let me place (*vaippām*) both his feet (*kaḻaliṇaikaḷ*) on my head (*emcirattil*) and in my heart (*karuttil*).

VERSE 6

paṇṭaimaṟai vaṇṭuaraṟṟap pacuntēṉ ñāṉam
parintuoḻukac civakantam parantu nāṟak

---

[333] Six treatises, which aid the study of the Vedas (vētāṅkam in Tamil), are: *ciṭcai*, *viyākaraṇam*, *cantacu*, *niruttam*, *cōtiṭam,* and *kaṟpam*) (Tamil Lexicon, p. 3832). The equivalent Sanskrit terms in *vedāṅga* (limbs of the Veda) are: *śikṣā* (phonetic analysis), *vyākaraṇa* (grammar), *chandas* (meter and prosody), *nirukta* (etymological analysis), *jyotiṣa* (astronomy, astrology, and mathematics), and *kalpa* (ritual and dharma). See JOHNSON 2009:345.

[334] There are sixty-four arts and sciences (Tamil Lexicon, p. 180).

[335] *Vīrakkaḻal* refers to a string of little bells worn as an anklet to signify heroism. (Tamil Lexicon, p. 3754).

kaṇṭa irutayakamala mukaikaḷ ellām
kaṇṭiṟappak kāciṉimēl vantaaruṭ katirōṉ
viṇṭamalarp poḻilpuṭaicūḻ veṇṇey mēvum
meykaṇṭa tēvaṉmiku caiva nātaṉ
puṇṭarika malartāḷac cirattē vāḻum
poṟpātam eppōtum pōṟṟal ceyvām.

[This verse pays homage to the author's (Aruṇanti's) spiritual preceptor, Meykaṇṭa Tēvar. The poet in a very eloquent figure of speech suggests that the Vedas are the bees, the Śaiva knowledge is the honey, the hearts of the devotees are the lotus flowers, and the grace of Śiva is the fragrance. The imagery offered by the poet is exquisite].

TRANSLATION:

With the bees humming (*vaṇṭuararṟa*) the ancient Vedas (*paṇṭaimaṟai*), with the honey of refined Śaiva knowledge (*pacuntēṉ ñāṉam*) dripping with affection (*parintu oḻuka*), with the Śaiva fragrance (*civakantam*) spreading everywhere (*parantu nāṟa*), with all the lotus buds of the hearts (*irutaya kamala mukaikaḷ ellām*) of the followers (*kaṇṭa*) blossoming (*kaṇṭiṟappa*), Meykaṇṭatēvar (*meykaṇṭa tēvaṉ*), the protector of Śaivism (*caiva nātaṉ*), appeared on the earth (*kāciṉimēl vanta*) as a brilliant sun (*aruṭ katirōṉ*) at Tiruveṇṇey Nallūr (*veṇṇey mēvum*),[336] where the groves are full of fragrant flowers (*viṇṭa malar poḻil puṭai cūḻ*). Let us always worship him (*eppōtum pōṟṟal ceyvām*) with his golden feet (*poṟ pātam*), which resemble lotuses (*puṇṭarika malar tāḷa*) staying on our heads (*cirattē vāḻum*).

VERSE 7

---

[336] At Tiruveṇṇey Nallūr, Meykaṇṭatēvar received his initiation (*civatīkṣai*). MUDALIAR 1988:1341. "According to tradition, he was found on temple-tank's steps by Accutar Kaḷappāḷar, a veḷḷāḷa chieftain of Tiruppeṇṇākaṭam." See ZVELEBIL 1995:435.

mālayaṉmā maṟaiaṟiyā ātimārkkam
vaiyakattu ākamamvētam maṟṟum uḷḷa
nūlaiyelām uṇarntuiṟaivaṉ kaḻalē nōkkum
nōṉmaiarun tavarmuṉyāṉ nuvalumāṟu
vēlaiyulā vumtiraikaḷ vīci yēṟi
vēṟuēḻum oṉṟāki niṉṟa pōtu
cālavumāṉ kuḷappaṭiyil taṅki niṉṟa
calamatutāṉ nēreṉṉum taṉmaittālō.

[This verse is the customary preface usually offered by authors at the commencement of their works (*avaiyaṭakkam*). The poet compares the realized sages to the enormity of the seven mighty oceans combined together, and his own knowledge to the miniscule amount of the puddle of water collected in the footprint of a deer. Humility is the undertone, and the poetic elegance shines through].

TRANSLATION:

I [the poet] desire to describe (*yāṉ nuvalumāṟu*) the ancient Śaiva principles (*āti mārkkam*) which are not understood (*aṟiyā*) by Viṣṇu, Brahmā and even the four Vedas (*māl ayaṉ mā maṟai*) of the world (*vaiyakattu*), to [an audience of] austere ascetics (*nōṉmaiarun tavarmuṉyāṉ*) who have mastered (*uṇarntu*) the Āgamas, the Vedas (*ākamam vētam*) and other treatises (*maṟṟum uḷḷa nūlai yelām*) and who are concentrating on the feet (*kaḻalē nōkkum*) of god (*iṟaivaṉ*) [with great endurance] and ignoring sickness (*nōṉmai*). This is similar to equating the nature of (*atutāṉ nēreṉṉum taṉmaittālō*) the small puddles of water (*calam*) collected in the footprints of a deer (*māṉ kuḷappaṭiyil taṅki niṉṟa*) to the seven mighty oceans (*ēḻum vēlai*) full of heaving waves (*yulā vum tiraikaḷ vīci yēṟi*) and collected in one place (*oṉṟāki niṉṟa pōtu*).

VERSE 8

nīṭupukaḷ ulakutaṉil maintar mātar
nēyamoṭu tāmpayanta putalvar vāyil
kūṭumoḻi maḻalaiyoṭu kuḻaṟi oṉṟum
kuṟippu aritu āyiṭiṉummikak kulavip pōṟṟi
māṭunamakku itueṉṟu koṇṭu vāḻvar
atupōla maṉṉutamiḻp pulamai yōreṉ
pāṭukavik kuṟṟaṅkaḷ pārār innūl
pārāṭṭā niṟpar aruṭ pariciṉālē.

[This verse is also a humble preface. In the previous verse, the poet expresses the humility of his endeavor, and in this verse, he solicits acceptance and support from the Tamil poetic community of his time].

TRANSLATION:

In this long-established famous world (*nīṭu pukaḷ ulakutaṉil*), men and women (*maintar mātar*) admire the babbling and confused noises (*maḻalaiyoṭu kuḻaṟi*) coming out of the mouths of their infants (*putalvar vāyil*), which are born (*tām payanta*) out of their affection (*nēyamoṭu*) [for each other]; even if the words (*kūṭumoḻi*) do not mean anything (*oṉṟum kuṟippu aritu āyiṭiṉummika*), they rejoice (*kulavi*), and they live (*vāḻvar*) celebrating (*pōṟṟi*) [their infants] as their wealth (*māṭu namakku itu eṉṟu*). Likewise (*atupōla*), well established (*maṉṉu*) famous Tamil poets (*tamiḻp pulamai yōr*) will [should] ignore my poetic errors (*eṉ pāṭukavik kuṟṟaṅkaḷ pārār*), and because of their benevolence (*aruṭ pariciṉālē*) will [should] commend (*pārāṭṭā niṟpar*) this treatise (*innūl*).

VERSE 9

cuttavaṭivu iyalpāka uṭaiya cōti
colliya ākamaṅkaḷelām cūḻap pōyum
ottumuṭi yumkūṭa ōri ṭattē
orupatikkup palaneṟikaḷ uḷavāṉāṟpōl
pittarkuṇam atupōla orukāl uṇṭāyp

piṉṉorukāl aṟiviṉṟip pētai yōrāyk
kattiṭumāṉ mākkaḷuraik kaṭṭil paṭṭōr
kaṉakavarai kuṟittuppōyk kaṭaṟkē vīḻvār.

[In this verse, the poet highlights the importance of the treatise (*nūṟciṟappu*). The poet distinguishes those who do not have any clear idea about a particular religion but have only vague opinions, from those whose convictions are clear. He compares the former group of delusional followers to a person who stumbles due to lack of coordination in the movement of legs. Such persons wishing to reach Mount Meru will end up falling into the ocean].

TRANSLATION:

Even though all the Āgamas (*ākamaṅkaḷ elām*) dictated by Civaṉ (*cōti*)[337] with pure knowledge (*cutta vaṭivu*) as his natural form (*iyalpāka uṭaiya*) differ in their focus (*cūḻap pōyum*), [yet] they all meet at the same point [lead to the same knowledge] (*ottumuṭiyum kūṭa ōriṭattē*) just as (*uḻavāṉāṟ pōl*) there are several paths (*palaneṟikaḷ*) leading to the same town (*orupatikku*). Those people (*āṉmākkaḷ*) [who do not realize this] are delusional (*pittarkuṇam atupōla*), with their rear leg not knowing [not coordinating] (*piṉṉorukāl aṟiviṉṟi*) what the front leg does [with the front leg] (*orukāl uṇṭāy*).[338] Not knowing the right path for knowledge (*pētai yōrāy*), [they] shout (*kattiṭum*) that their path is the best path (*uraik kaṭṭil paṭṭōr*). They will proceed towards the Meru Mountain[339] (*kaṉakavarai kuṟittuppōy*) and fall into the ocean (*kaṭaṟkē vīḻvār*).

---

[337] The word *cōti* means brilliance or splendor. It is also an epithet of Śiva. (Tamil Lexicon, p.1667).

[338] The poet uses a figure of speech to indicate the lack of clarity and proper thinking of those missing comprehension and compares their delusional thinking to the lack of coordination between the legs, which results in stumbling.

[339] "Meru is the fabulous mountain (regarded as the Olympus of Hindū mythology and said to form the central point of Jambu-dvīpa; all the planets revolve around it, and it is compared to the cup or seed-vessel of a lotus, the leaves of which are formed by different Dvīpas." *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Monier-Williams. s.v. "Ekātman" (p. 230)*.

VERSE 10

pōtamikut tōr tokutta pētai maikkē
poruntiṉōr ivarkku aṉṟi katippāl cella
ētuneṟi eṉumavarkaṭku aṟiya muṉṉāḷ
iṟaivaṉ aruḷ nantitaṉakku iyampa nanti
kōtilaruṭ caṉaṟkumā rarkkuk kūṟak
kuvalayattiṉ avvaḻiem kurunātaṉ koṇṭu
tītuakala emakkuaḻitta ñāṉa nūlait
tērntuuraippaṉ civañāṉa citti eṉṟē.

[This verse explains the lineage of the poet (*kuruparamparai*) and describes the genesis of his work along with the name of his undertaking (*nūṟkatikāriyum*, *nūlvaḻiyum*, *nūṟpeyarum*)].

TRANSLATION:

This work is not addressed (*ivarkku aṉṟi*) to those who are erudite in the scriptures (*pōtam mikuttōr*) nor to those who are ignorant of such a knowledge (*tokutta pētai maikkē poruntiṉōr*). To teach (*avarkaṭku aṟiya*) those who seek the righteous path [for release] (*ētuneṟi eṉum*) and proceed along that path (*katippāl cella*), Śiva first graced Nandi[340] with the knowledge (*iṟaivaṉ aruḷ nanti taṉakku iyampa*), and Nanti (*nanti*) in turn, conveyed it to Caṉaṟkumārar[341] (*kōtil aruṭ caṉaṟkumārarkku kūṟa*). My teacher (*em kuru nātaṉ*), who came along such lineage (*kuvalayattiṉ avvaḻi*) offered me (*emakku aḻitta*) this impeccable, faultless (*tītu akala*), and erudite composition (*ñāṉa nūlai*).[342] Following that path (*avvaḻi koṇṭu*), I submit [offer my work] (*tērntuuraippaṉ*) as the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*

[340] Nandi (Nanti in Tamil) is the chief attendant of Śiva, having a bull's face.

[341] Refers to a sage, one of four caṉakātiyār, *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "Caṉaṟkumārar" (p. 1348)*. The four celebrated sages, spiritual or mind-born sons of Brahmā: Caṉakaṉ, Caṉātaṉaṉ, Caṉaṟ-kumāraṉ, and Caṉantaṉaṉ. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "Caṉakaṉ" (p. 1347)*.

[342] Refers to the work *Civañāṉapōtam*, composed by his teacher Meykaṇṭār.

(*civañāṉa citti eṉṟē*).

VERSE 11

iṟaivaṉaiyum iṟaivaṉāl iyampumnūlum
īṇṭu aḻavum poruḷ iyalpum vēṇṭum ceyti
muṟaimaikaḻum pettamoṭu muttiyellām
mūtulakil emakkuiyaṉṟa muyaṟci yālē
ciṟaiyulavum puṉalnilavit tōṉṟum pēyttērc
ceykaipōl uṇṭāya poykoḷ mārkkat
tuṟaipalavum kaṭāviṭaiyāl collippōkkit
tukaḻtīra innūlil colla kiṟpām.

[This verse, in a nutshell, outlines the purpose of this treatise. (*nūṟkaruttu*)].

TRANSLATION:

[Discussions in this treatise are] about god (*iṟaivaṉaiyum*), about the work composed by god (*iṟaivaṉāl iyampum nūlum*) [Vedas], about the ways of knowing (*aḻavum*) in this world (*īṇṭu*),[343] about the nature of things known by the means of knowing (*poruḷ iyalpum*), about the steps to be followed to understand the truth (*vēṇṭum ceyti muṟaimaikaḻum*), about the state of bondage in life due to ignorance (*pettamoṭu*), and about reaching salvation (*muttiyellām*). There are many (*palavum*) false religions with false beliefs (*poykoḷ mārkkat tuṟai*) in this ancient world (*mūtu ulakil*); [those who seek them] are comparable to those who go after (*ceykaipōl*) a mirage (*pēyttēr*) that appears (*tōṉṟum*) to be real water (*nilavit puṉal*) with waves (*ciṟaiyulavum*) [only to be disappointed]. By my own righteous effort (*emakku iyaṉṟa muyaṟci yālē*), by means of questions and answers (*kaṭāviṭaiyāl*), by pointing out (*collippōkki*) and exposing their false beliefs (*tukaḻtīra*), [truth] will be established (*colla kiṟpām*) in this treatise (*innūlil*).

---

[343] The word *īṇṭu* could mean “in this world” or “to be collected, to come together” *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "aṉupūti" (p. 195)*.

4.1A LOKĀYATA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 12-32)

VERSE 12

intira purōkitaṉ iyampumoru nūliṉ
tantiram eṉātuaṟi viṉōṭu aruḷilāmal
cantaṇai puyattumaṇa mālaikaḷ tayaṅka
untiula kattil ula kāyataṉ uraippāṉ.

[In this verse, the poet introduces the Lokāyata (*ulakāyataṉ*)[344] in unflattering terms, and in the next 21 verses, he elaborates what he understands to be the basic tenets of the Lokāyata school as though someone belonging to that school is relating them].

TRANSLATION:

[Based on] a treatise composed by (*iyampum oru nūliṉ*) Indra's priest (*intira purōkitaṉ*), not knowing it was due to a trick played on him (*tantiram eṉātu aṟiviṉōṭu*)[345] and without grace (*aruḷ ilāmal*), smeared with sandalwood paste (*cantaṇai puyattu*), and with garlands of flowers full of fragrance (*maṇa mālaikaḷ*) hanging over (*tayaṅka*) his stomach (*unti*), the Lokāyata will describe [his "materialist" world view] to the world (*ulakattil ulakāyataṉ uraippāṉ*).

VERSE 13

īṇṭu aḷavai kāṭci maṉam āti iru mūṉṟāy
vēṇṭum aṉumāṉam mutal āṉapala vēṇṭā
pūṇṭaporuḷ pūtamavai pukaḻkaṭiṉa cītam

---

[344] The Lokāyata (Sanskrit) school, also known as the Cārvāka school, is a heterodox school of Indian philosophy; they are materialist philosophers of empirical attitude See JOHNSON 2009:80.

[345] One of the Purāṇic stories describes the genesis of the Lokāyata school. Once when Indra was tormented by demons (*acurarkaḷ*), he resorted to penance. Bṛhaspati, his teacher, in order to engage Indra in worldly activities and sensual pleasures, composed a treatise with all the principles of the Lokāyata school spelled out and tricked Indra into accepting the doctrines of the school. MUTTAPPAN 2003:13. (the author does not provide any further details).

tīṇṭuariya vemmaicalaṉittuṉōṭu cērvē.

[This verse explains the principles of the Lokāyata school].

TRANSLATION:

In this world (*īṇṭu*), perception (*kāṭci*) is the only indispensable (*vēṇṭum*) way of knowing (*aḷavai*). This perception, because of the mind (*maṉam*), appears as six kinds[346] [two times three] (*iru mūṉṟāy*). [Besides], other ways of knowing such as inference (*aṉumāṉa mutal āṉa pala*) are not required [not valid] (*vēṇṭā*). Objects [thus] perceived (*pūṇṭaporuḷ*) are a combination (*cērvē*) of the properties of those [four][347] famous [well-known] (*pukaḷ*) elements (*pūtam*) [such as] hardness (*kaṭiṉa*), coldness (*cītam*), heat for touch [warmth] (*tīṇṭu ariya vemmai*) and movement (*calaṉam*).

VERSE 14

cāṟṟupeyar āṉavai talampuṉal kaṉalpiṉ
kāṟṟumeṉalām ivai kalantakuṇam ōtiṉ
nāṟṟamira tam uruvam naṟparicam ākum
pōṟṟumivai nitta iyal pām ivai puṇarppē.

[This verse explains the four elements and their properties as understood by the Lokāyatas].

TRANSLATION:

The names (*cāṟṟu peyar āṉavai*) of the four elements are earth (*talam*), water (*puṉal*), fire (*kaṉal*), and air (*kāṟṟum*). Smell (*nāṟṟam*), taste (*iratam*), form

---

[346] These six kinds are: *aiyyakkāṭci* (doubting if it is a snake or a rope), *vāyil kāṭci* (knowing by sense perception), *vikaṟpakkāṭci* (knowing by classification and nature), *anvayakkāṭci* (knowledge about fire due to smoke), *vetirēkakkāṭci* (knowledge of a flower due its fragrance), and *tirupukkāṭcI* (mistaking a rope for a snake) MUTTAPPAN 2003:13.

[347] See the next verse.

(*uruvam*) and [sense of] touch (*naṟparicam*) are their respective properties (*iyal pām ākum*). These four are everlasting (*nitta*). Because of the association among them (*kalantakuṇam pōṟṟum ivai*), all the forms in the universe are created (*ivai puṇarppē*).

VERSE 15

ottuuṟu puṇarcciyiṉ urukkaḷpala ākum
vaittuṟu kaṭātipala maṇṇiṉvaru māpōl
puttikuṇa naṟpoṟi pulaṉkaḷ ivai ellām
ittilvarum nīriṉil eḻumkumiḻi ottē.

[This verse explains the evolution of the universe from the elements].

TRANSLATION:

The four elements unite (*puṇarcciyiṉ*) in proper proportions (*ottuuṟu*) to create all the objects (*urukkaḷ pala ākum*) [seen in the universe]. Just as (*pōl*) many objects (*kaṭāti pala*) appear from the clay (*maṇṇiṉvaru*) in a potter's wheel (*vaittuṟu*),[348] because of the union of the elements, intelligence (*putti*), inherent nature [characteristics] (*kuṇa*), sense organs with their faculties ((*pulaṉkaḷ naṟpoṟi*), all these (*ivai ellām*) appear as air bubbles (*kumiḻi ottē*) in water (*nīriṉil eḻum*).

VERSE 16

pūtamatiṉ oṉṟupiri yappulaṉ iṟakkum
nītiyiṉil niṟpaṉa naṭappaṉavum muṉpōl
ōtumvakai yākiuṟu kāriyam ulantāl
ātiyavai yām itaṉai aṟivatu aṟivāmē.

[This verse explains what happens when the unified elements separate and how the objects are destroyed].

---

[348] *Tirikai* is a potter's wheel, but the poet uses *tuṟu*. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "aṉupūti" (p. 195)*.

TRANSLATION:

When one of the elements (*pūtamatiṉ*) leaves the union (*oṉṟu piriya*), organs will fail (*pulaṉ iṟakkum*). Because of this "order of things" (*nītiyiṉil*), both movable and immovable things (*niṟpaṉa naṭappaṉ avum*)[349] will die and revert to their original state of elements (*muṉpōl ōtumvakai*). Thus, effects from forms will revert to their cause [the four elements] (*yākiuṟu kāriyam ulantāl ātiyavai yām*). Knowledge of this [process] (*itaṉai aṟivatu*) is wisdom (*aṟivāmē*).

VERSE 17

ippaṭi aṉṟik kaṉmam uyir iṟai vēṟuṇṭu eṉṟu
ceppiṭum avarkku maṇṇōr ceytiṭum kuṟṟam eṉṉō!
oppilā malaṭi peṟṟa makaṉ oru muyaṟkompu ēṟit
tappil ākāyap pūvaip paṟittamai cāṟṟiṉārē.

[This verse negates the concept of god, *karumam* or *kaṉmam* (*karma* in Sanskrit), and *āṉmam* (*ātman* in Sanskrit). For the Lokāyata the world is created and dissolved by the association and disassociation of the elements respectively. They scoff at other schools that deceive the world at large with their meaningless concepts of god, karma, and soul. What they say is as ridiculous as the son of a barren woman climbing the horn of a hare to pluck a flower from the sky!].

TRANSLATION:

In view of this (*ippaṭi aṉṟi*), what wrong (*kuṟṟam eṉṉō*) did the world do (*maṇṇōr ceytiṭum*) to the proponents of [these] religions (*ceppiṭum avarkku*) that they should say (*cāṟṟiṉārē*) karma (*kaṉmam*), soul (*uyir*) and god (*iṟai*) exist (*vēṟuṇṭu eṉṟu*)? It is similar to [saying] that the son (*makaṉ*) of the incomparable barren woman (*oppilā malaṭi peṟṟa*) climbed the horn of the hare (*oru muyaṟ kompu ēṟi*)

[349] Muttappan translates "*niṟpaṉa naṭappaṉ avum*" as "activities like standing and walking" See MUTTAPPAN 2003:15.

and faultlessly (*tappilā*) plucked (*paṟittamai*) the flower from the sky (*ākāyap pūvaip*).[350]

VERSE 18

ceytiṭum kaṉmam ellām ceytavar tammaip paṟṟi
eytiṭum eṉṉil iṅkē māyntiṭum ēyvatu eṅṅaṉ?
meytaru tūlam keṭṭuc cūkkamāy mēvum eṉṉil
aiyaṉē tīpam pōṉāl ataṉoḷi āvatu uṇṭō.

[This verse negates the concept of karma].

TRANSLATION:

If the actions done in the previous life (*ceytiṭum kaṉmam ellām*) will yield results in the present life (*ceytavar tammaip paṟṟi eytiṭum eṉṉil*), how could they reappear in the next life [just as good and bad actions done in this life will die with the body] (*iṅkē māyntiṭum ēyvatu eṅṅaṉ*)? Sir (*aiyaṉē*), if you say (*mēvum eṉṉil*) that the soul (*mey*) appears in its subtle form (*cūkkamāy*) and not in its gross form (*tūlam keṭṭu*), [tell me] will the light provided by the flame still be there (*ataṉ oḷi āvatu uṇṭō*) even in the absence of the [wick of the] lamp (*tīpam pōṉāl*)?

VERSE 19

māyntupiṉ vayalil iṭṭa vaitaḻai palikku māpōl
ēyntiṭum kaṉmam eṉṉil iṭṭa iṭattu icaiyum mēṉi
ōyntuvan tavarai uṇṇap paṇṇum cōṟu utarattu aṟṟāl
vāyntiṭum malam vayiṟṟil koṇṭiṭum vaḻakku vaittāy.

---

[350] It is almost normative in Indian philosophy that the same metaphors are used across different schools to express a concept or a logical preposition. This allows a common and acceptable base in terminology in building up arguments. To express a logical incongruence, inconsistency, or impossibility (e.g. a square circle), the metaphor "a barren woman's son" or the "horn of a hare" is used. The poet adds another metaphor for impossibility, "a flower in the sky."

[This verse reiterates the refusal of the concept of karma. The Lokāyata attacks the view that good or bad actions of a man done in this life will haunt him in his next life. In his example, he says that dead grass may reappear as grass again but only in the same place, not elsewhere. Therefore, he contends that such an argument is not tenable. The Lokāyata concludes that just as when food is consumed by a hungry man and the resulting excreta has no value, the actions done in this life are consummated here and now, and have no future value].

Translation:

If you suggest that (*eṉṉil*) just as the dead grass (*māyntupiṉ vaitaḷai*) [351] spread on the field [as manure] (*vayalil iṭṭa*) benefits [fertilizes] the crops (*palikku māpōl*), and the actions done in this life (*ēyntiṭum kaṉmam*) [will reappear in the next life, just as the rotting straw] reappears in the same place (*iṭṭa iṭattu icaiyum*) [and not elsewhere], [and if you also suggest that] the food (*cōṟu*) offered (*uṇṇap paṇṇum*) to a tired [hungry] man (*mēṉi ōyntu vantavarai*) gets digested in the stomach (*vayiṟṟil koṇṭiṭum*) and the resulting excreta (*vāyntiṭum malam*) leaving the stomach (*utarattu aṟṟāl*) have no value (*vaḷakku vaittāy*), [your view is not valid].

VERSE 20

uruvamum uṇarvum ceyti ottirā kaṉmam eṉṉiṉ
maruvukai viralkaḷ tammiṉ vaḷarvuṭaṉ kuṟaivu uṇṭāki
varuvatiṅku eṉṉa kaṉmam ceytu muṉ matiyilātāy
peruku pūtaṅkaḷ tammiṉ mikukuṟaip peṟṟi yāmē.

[This verse also opposes those who believe in the existence of karma. The multiple appearances of lives and their dissimilarities are due to the different proportions in the unity of the four elements].

---

[351] Straw plaits (*vaikkōl puriyiḻai)* are used in paddy fields. The poet has shortened the word as *"vaitaḷai*".

TRANSLATION:

If you say that [among all humans in the world], the nature of their bodies (*uruvamum eṉṉiṉ*), the nature of their actions (*uṇarvum*), [and the nature of their intelligence] are dissimilar (*ceyti ottirā*) because of their karma (*kaṉmam*), you fool (*matiyilātāy*),[352] what bad actions (*eṉṉa kaṉmam ceytu*) [bad karma] did the fingers (*viralkaḷ*) of a hand do to appear (*varuvatiṅku*) with dissimilar lengths (*vaḷarvuṭaṉ kuṟaivu uṇṭāki*)? Understand that the differences are due to (*peṟṟi yāmē*) the increasing and decreasing [varying portions] (*tammiṉ mikukuṟai*) of the elements (*peruku pūtaṅkaḷ*) in their union [bodies with differences are created].

VERSE 21

iṉpoṭu tuṉpam ellām eytuva kaṉmam eṉṉil
naṉpuṉal canta ṉāti naṇukavum aṇuka oṇṇā
miṉpoli aḻali ṉōṭu mēvuva naṉmai tīmai
eṉceytatu iyampiṭāy nī ivaiyelām iyalpa tāmē.

[This verse refutes those who believe in the carryover of karma from the previous birth (*muṉviṉaippayaṉ*). The Lokāyata demonstrates that the reasons for pain and pleasure in life are purely due to the elements. The same sandalwood produces fragrance when associated with water (pleasure), and yet still provides fragrance when associated with fire (pain). So, it is not the karma that produces the effect, but the associated elements that do].

TRANSLATION:

You say (*eṉṉil*) all pleasure and pain (*iṉpoṭu tuṉpam ellām*) [experienced by human beings] are due to karma (*eytuva kaṉmam*); Sandalwood (*cantaṉā*) combined with (*aṇuka oṇṇā*) clean water (*naṉ puṉal*) or associated with brilliant shiny (fire) [produces the same fragrance] (*miṉ poli aḻali ṉōṭu mēvuva*); so tell me

[352] The insulting epithet addresses those who oppose the Lokāyata school.

(*iyampiṭāy nī*), what good or bad [actions did sandalwood do] (*naṉmai tīmai eṉceytatu*); [know that] all these [manifestations] are due to the nature of the elements (*ivaiyelām iyalpa tāmē*).

VERSE 22

kāyattiṉ kuṇamatu aṉṟik kaṇṭatuāṉ māuṇṭāyiṉ
māyattiṟ colliṭātē maṉamutal āṟiṉukkum
nēyattatu āka vēṇṭum aṉṟiyē nikaḻttum uṇmai
tēyattiṉ muyaṟkompu ellai ceppuvōr ceyti yāmē.

[This verse refutes the existence of a soul].

TRANSLATION:

The soul (*āṉmā*) is the quality (*kuṇam*) displayed by (*kaṇṭatu*) the body (*kāyattiṉ*). Do not state in your stupor (*māyattiṟ colliṭātē*) that it [the soul] is something else (*atu aṉṟi uṇṭāyiṉ*). [If there is a soul], it must be in accordance with (*nēyattatu āka vēṇṭum*) the six ways of perception (*maṉamutal āṟiṉukkum*)[353]. Be informed (*ceyti yāmē*) that stating the truth otherwise (*aṉṟiyē nikaḻttum uṇmai*)[354] is comparable to those who talk about (*ceppuvōr*) the measurements (*ellai*) of a hare's horn (*muyaṟkompu*) in this world (*tēyattiṉ*).

VERSE 23

aruvamē iṟaivaṉ ākil aṟiviṉṟu ākāyam ākum
uruvamē eṉṉil pūtak kūṭṭattiṉ oruvaṉ ākum
maruviya iraṇṭum kūṭi niṟpavaṉ eṉṉiṉ maṇmēl
iruvicumpu orukal ēnti niṟkumō iyampi ṭāyē.

---

[353] The six types of perception should not be mistaken for the classical six ways of knowing in Indian epistemology. See the footnote of verse 13 for the six different ways of perception.

[354] The poet obliquely refers to other ways of knowing such as inference and testimony.

[This verse asserts that only the elements are real and denies the existence of god. If we throw a stone in the air, it will not stay there. It will fall down. Sky (space) is formless and the stone has a form. A state of being with a form, and a state of being without a form are mutually exclusive. The poet injects humor in his attacks and logical arguments].

TRANSLATION:

[If you say] god is without any form (*aruvamē iṟaivaṉ ākil*), then he is non-intelligent similar to the sky (*aṟiviṉṟu ākāyam ākum*). [On the other hand] if you say that god is with a form (*uruvamē eṉṉil*), then he is one of the objects (*oruvaṉ ākum*) in [this world] created by the union of the elements (*pūtak kūṭṭattiṉ*). If you suggest that god is a mixture of both form and no form (*iraṇṭum kūṭi maruviya niṟpavaṉ eṉṉiṉ*), tell me (*iyampi ṭāyē*) if the wide space (*iruvicumpu*) above the earth (*maṇmēl*) and a [suspended] stone (*oru kal*) could stay together (*ēnti niṟkumō*).

VERSE 24

pūtattē aṉṉa māki aṉṉattāl uṭampu putti
pētittē maṉamum ākip pirintamai tirunta iṉṟu
vētattē uraikka eṉṉō mētiṉi yōrkaḷ ellām
kētattē vīṉtu vēṟu neṟiyal kēṭku māṟē.

[This verse explains the role of the mind].

TRANSLATION:

Food appears from the element [earth] (*pūtattē aṉṉa māki*), from food (*aṉṉattāl*) appear the body (*uṭampu*), the intellect (*putti*) and the differentiating mind (*pētittē maṉamum āki*)[355]; and they revert back (*pirintamai tirunta*) [to the elements]. The

[355] Schools of Indian philosophy such as the Sāṁkhya and Vedānta systems accept a complex entity of intellect (*mahat* or *buddhi*), 'the sense of I' (*ahaṃkāra*), and 'mind (*manas*) as the basis

Vedas[356] say the same (*vētattē uraikka*). Why do all worldly people (*mētiṉi yōrkaḷ llām*) not learn [and follow] (*kēṭku māṟē*) other paths (*vēṟu neṟiyal*) instead of falling into distress (*kētattē vīḻntu*) [by following your path]?

VERSE 25

pōkattai maṇṇil kaṇṭu viṭṭuppōy viṇṇil koḷḷa
mōkattar āki allal muyaṉṟu uḻal mūṭar ellām
tākattil taṇṇīr kaṇṭu viṭṭuppōyt taṇṇīr kēṭṭuc
cōkittē uṇṇa eṇṇit tuyaṟ uṟuvārkaḷ antō.

[This verse denies the existence of heaven and the pleasures that are imagined to be offered there].

TRANSLATION:

Some fools (*mūṭar ellām*) reject (*viṭṭuppōy*) worldly (*maṇṇil*) sensual pleasures (*pōkattai kaṇṭu*) because they think that heaven (*viṇṇil koḷḷa*) has more pleasures to offer (*mōkattar āki*). This is similar to a thirsty man (*tākattil*) senselessly wandering and roaming about (*uḻal*) after a mirage (*taṇṇīr kēṭṭu*) to drink that water (*uṇṇa eṇṇi*), ignoring the potable water that is readily available in his presence (*taṇṇīr kaṇṭu viṭṭuppōy*) to quench his thirst; [as a result], he suffers (*cōkittē*) anguish and distress (*tuyaṟ uṟuvārkaḷ*). What a pity (*antō*)!

VERSE 26

vāḻavē vallai vāmi valaikkaitā eṉṉuyirkkut
tōḻaṉ nīuṉṉai oppār colliṭiṉ illai kaṇṭāy
kōḻai māṉuṭar tīṭueṉṉum kolaikaḷavu āti koṇṭē
cūḻumvār kuḻalār moyppac cuṭar eṉat tōṉṟi ṉāyē.

---

of all mental life. It is considered an internal organ of the body (antaḥkaraṇa). See Johnson 2009:21.

356 Contextually, the word Veda here refers generically to the treatises of other religions.

[This verse praises another school, the left-handed Tantric school that has similar views as its own (Lokāyata)].

TRANSLATION:

Long live (*vāḻavē*) the one who follows the path of *Vāma* [left-handed Tantric school] (*vāmi*)![357] Give me your right hand (*valaikkaitā*).[358] You (*nī*) are my life-long friend (*eṉṉuyirkkut tōḻaṉ*). There is no one (*illai*) who could be said (*colliṭiṉ*) [to be] comparable to you (*uṉṉai oppār*). You follow the path (*āti koṇṭē*) of murder (*kolai*) and robbery (*kaḷavu*) which cowardly men (*kōḻai māṉuṭar*) reject as evil (*tītu eṉṉum*). Among the company of maidens with lovely braids (*cūḻumvār kuḻalār*), you shine with brilliance (*moyppac cuṭar eṉat tōṉṟi ṉāyē*).

VERSE 27

īcaṉār ayaṉār mālōṭu intiraṉ terivai mārpāl
pēcoṇā vakaikaḷ ellām ceytuaṉṟō periyōr āṉār
ācaiyāl avarpōl nāmum ākavē vēṇṭum āyiṉ
vācamār kuḻalā rōṭum vallavā kūṭi vāḻmiṉ.

[This verse highlights the importance of sensory pleasures to be enjoyed with women in this life. In a clever way, the poet uses the names of celestial divinities such as Śiva, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Indra and their association with their consorts to promote the hedonistic views of the Lokāyata school].

TRANSLATION:

Śiva (*īcaṉār*), Brahmā (*ayaṉār*), Tirumāl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*), and Indra (*intiraṉ*) attained

---

[357] The poet recognizes the "left-handed" Tantric school (*vāmamārkattār*), which closely resembles the Lokāyata school in its revelry of hedonistic lives. Just as the Lokāyatas, they engage in sensual pleasures and do not consider intoxicants to be bad; they condone debauchery, murder and robbery. See MUTTAPPAN 2003:21-22.

[358] The expression "give me your right hand" is an expression of friendship with admiration. See MUTTAPPAN 2003:22.

fame (*periyōr āṉār*) by their amorous words (*mārpāl pēcoṇā*) and other ways (*vakaikaḷ ellām ceytuaṉṟō*) with young women (*terivai*). Therefore, if we desire (*ācaiyāl*) to become famous (*ākavē vēṇṭum āyiṉ*) similar to them (*avarpōl*), we (*nāmum*) must associate ourselves appropriately (*vallavā kūṭi*) with young women with fragrant braids (*vācamār kuḻalā rōṭum*) and enjoy life (*vāḻmiṉ*).

VERSE 28

taiyalār ūṭal āṭat tāmava rōṭum kūṭic
ceyya tāmaraiyai veṉṟa cīṟaṭi cempañcu ūṭṭi
meyyelām pātam cūṭum vēṭattār meyyiṟ kūṭā
maiyalmāṉuṭar poy mārkka vēṭattē māykiṉ ṟārē.

[This verse elaborates on the same theme discussed above. This verse and the following three have graphic erotic imagery. The poet indulges in a vivid visual image of amorous displays of courting and copulation. In a sarcastic way, the poet, in the persona of the Lokāyata, chides those who follow a false austere path of mortification rather than a hedonistic pursuit of sensual pleasure].

TRANSLATION:

To induce bodily desires (*ūṭal āṭa*)[359] in women (*taiyalār*) and to eventually satisfy them with sexual union (*tām avarōṭum kūṭicceyya*), a man should dye the [already] red-colored feet [of women] (*cīṟaṭi ūṭṭi*) with red paste (*cempañcu*)[360] which [makes the feet] superior to red lotus flowers (*tāmaraiyai veṉṟa*), and [with his body close to them] allow their feet to smear the paste all over his body (*pātam cūṭum meyyelām*). Many men [followers] (*māṉuṭar*), who follow the Vedas [treatises] (*vēṭattār*) without knowing this truth (*meyyiṟ kūṭā maiy*), follow false

[359] The word *ūṭal* is very significant in the *akam* genre of Tamil poetry. It describes the theme of lovers' quarrels, sulking of the woman and their eventual reconciliation with a sexual union. See Zvelebil for an exhaustive treatment of this poetic genre. ZVELEBIL 1973:90-101.

[360] *cempañcu* – paste prepared from red-cotton (Brazil cotton), colored with lac-dye to dye a woman's feet. See *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "cīṭam" (p. 1475)*.

paths of the Vedas [treatises] (*poy mārkka vēṭattē*), [and] live in a stupor (*māykiṉ ṟārē*).

VERSE 29

vācamār kuḻali ṉārkaḷ maṇi alkul taṭattē mūḻki
nēcamār kumutat cevvāy amutiṉai niṟaiya uṇṭu
tēculā maṇimeṉ tōḷmēl cērntuvīṟṟu iruntiṭātē
māculā maṉattōr ellām maṟumai koṇṭu aḻivar maṉṉō.

[This verse continues the theme from the previous verse].

TRANSLATION:

[Those who follow other schools] instead of enjoying a young woman with fragrant hair (*vācamār kuḻalinārkaḷ*) by plunging into the opening [of her genital area] (*taṭattē mūḻki*), [near/below] the jewel (*maṇi*)[361] eating plenty of (*niṟaiya uṇṭu*) nectar (*amutiṉai*) from the desirous (*nēcamār*) red opening (*cevvāy*) of her vulva (*alkul*), which resembles a red water lily (*kumutam*), and not uniting with her (*cērntu vīṟṟu iruntiṭātē*) who has fine shoulders with brilliant jewels (*tēculā maṇimeṉ tōḷmēl*), all these [followers of other schools] with their soiled souls (*māculā maṉattōr ellām*) destroy their lives (*aḻivar maṉṉō*) thinking they will [only] enjoy the sensual pleasures in heaven (*maṟumai koṇṭu*).

VERSE 30

matinilā nutalā rōṭu maṇinilā muṉṟil ēṟi
mutirnilā eṟippac ceyvāy iḷanilā mukiḻppa moytta
katirnilā vaṭaṅkoḷ koṅkaik kaṇkaḷmārpu akala mūḻkum

---

[361] "The jewel refers to the jeweled girdle of seven or eight strands worn by women." However, forsaking modesty, it is easy to infer contextually that the poet mentions the word jewel referring to the clitoris in a woman's genitals. The verse describes the pleasure derived from the act of cunnilingus.

putunilā viyanaṉ pōkam viṭuvarpuṉ camayat tōrē.

[This verse continues, with the theme of carnal pleasures to be enjoyed in this life].

TRANSLATION:

[To embrace a woman] whose forehead resembles the crescent of the moon (*matinilā nutalā rōṭu*) in the brilliantly moonlit (*maṇinilā*) courtyard (*muṉṟil ēṟi*), the brilliance of the full moon brightening (*mutirnilā eṟippa*) her captivating, beautiful smile (*ceyvāy mukiḻppa moytta*), [holding her] so tightly against your chest (*mārpu akala mūḻkum*) that the shiny strands of her necklace (*katirnilā vaṭaṅkoḷ*) press against the nipples of her breast (*koṅkaik kaṇkaḷ*), and without enjoying these new experiences of sensual pleasure (*putu nilāviya naṉ pōkam*), the followers of other schools are losers (*viṭuvar puṉ camayat tōrē*).

VERSE 31

ūṭuvatu uṇarvatu uṟṟa kalavimaṅ kaiyarai uḷki
vāṭuvatu aṭiyil vīḻntu varuntuvatu aruntavam piṉ
kūṭuvatu uṇarvu keṭṭuk kuṇamelām vēṭkai yēyāy
nīṭuvatu iṉpa mutti ittilniṉ ṟārkaḷ muttar.

[This verse continues the theme of hedonistic pleasures and the poet suggests that the difficult experiences encountered in love while courting a woman is the penance (*tavam*) and the physical union with that woman is the release (*mutti*)].

TRANSLATION:

Having amorous thoughts (*ūṭuvatu*) of women (*maṅkaiyarai*) with whom [one] has had a [recent] physical union (*kalavi uṟṟa*), to make up after a quarrel (*uṇarvatu*), to be sad (*varuntuvatu*) and think of them (*uḷki*) [when they are away], and to fall on their feet (*aṭiyil vīḻntu*) and long for them (*vāṭuvatu*) are the great austerities (*aruntavam*). Then to have physical union with them (*piṉ kūṭuvatu*), numbing

one's senses (*uṇarvu keṭṭu*) with repeated lengthened (*nīṭuvatu iṉpa*) indulgences in those pleasures of love (*kuṇamelām vēṭkai yēyāy*) is the true realization [*mukti* In Sanskrit] (*mutti*). These are the ways of the realized souls (*ittil niṉṟārkaḷ muttar*).

VERSE 32

vīṭṭiṉai uḷatueṉṟu ōṭi melivatuiṅku eṉṉai? vīṭu
kāṭṭiṉōr kaṇṭōr kēṭṭōr kariyavai uṇṭēl kāṭṭīr
nāṭṭiṉil aracaṉ āṇaikku icaiyavē naṭantu nāḷum
īṭṭiya poruḷ koṇṭu iṅkē iṉpattuḷ icainti ṭīrē.

[This verse points out the futility of following an austere path to attain *mutti* or release].

TRANSLATION:

Why should one undergo (*eṉṉai*) emaciation (*melivatu*) in this birth (*iṅku*) thinking there will be pleasure (*uḷatueṉṟu*) in heaven (*vīṭṭiṉai*)? Show me (*kāṭṭīr*) one who has pointed out heavenly pleasure (*vīṭu kāṭṭiṉōr*), who has seen [heavenly pleasure] (*kaṇṭōr*) or who can relate to (*kēṭṭōr*) [heavenly pleasure]? Are there any witnesses (*kariyavai uṇṭēl*) [to authenticate such claims]? Follow the orders (*āṇaikku icaiyavē naṭantu*) of the king of the country (*nāṭṭiṉil aracaṉ*), and with the wealth earned over time (*īṭṭiya poruḷ koṇṭu nāḷum*) enjoy life in this world (*iṅkē iṉpattuḷ icainti ṭīrē*).

4.1B LOKĀYATA SCHOOL (SIDDHĀNTIN – VERSES 33-63)

VERSE 33

uḷḷatāvatu kaṇṭatu eṉṟuurai koṇṭatu ēṉ? ula kattu nī
piḷḷai yāyvaḷar kiṉṟa nāḷuṇaip peṟṟa tāyoṭu tantaiyaik
kaḷḷa mēpuri kālaṉ āruyir uṇṇa, iṉṟuoru kāḷaiyāy
meḷḷa vēuḷar eṉṟu koṇṭu viḷampu māṟu viḷampiṭē.

[Up to the previous verse, the poet elucidated some of the principles of the Lokāyata school as though someone belonging to that school related them. However, it should be noted that the poet took one aspect of the school, hedonism, and exaggerated it to serve his own purpose. In polemical debates, using an argument of this technique is called "an informal fallacy," also referred to as "attacking a straw man." Now the poet addresses the Lokāyata, and starts to refute those principles basing his arguments on the tenets of Śaiva Siddhānta. It must be noted that the Lokāyata school accepts only perception as a valid means of knowledge and does not recognize other means including inference and testimony. See the footnote at the end of the verse].

TRANSLATION:

[Lokāyata!] Why do you say (*ēṉ eṉṟuurai koṇṭatu nī*) that perception (*kaṇṭatu*) is the only truth (*uḷḷatāvatu*) [admissible way of knowing] in this world (*ulakattu*)? When you were an infant (*piḷḷaiyāy vaḷarkiṉṟa nāḷ*), the precious lives (*āruyir*) of your mother who gave birth to you (*uṉai peṟṟa tāyoṭu*) and your father (*tantai*) were eaten [killed] (*uṇṇa*) by Yama (*puri kālaṉ*)[362], who steals [kills people] (*kaḷḷa mē*)[363]. Today, as you are growing into a young man (*iṉṟu oru kāḷaiyāy*), understand what has been explained (*viḷampu māṟu viḷampiṭē*) that you had parents (*meḷḷa vē uḷar eṉṟu koṇṭu*) [you knew your parents by inference only and not by perception].[364]

---

[362] The word *puri* in this context means a rope; *Kālaṉ* is an epithet of Yama, the god of death, who, metaphorically speaking, uses a rope as a noose to snatch away lives.

[363] The suggestion here is that the lives of the parents were stolen when the young man was in his infancy.

[364] When a child who lost his parents in infancy grows up and thinks of them in his youth, he can only infer their existence. There was no perception. His own existence is based on inference that he once had parents. This verse establishes that inference is a valid way of knowing. The Sanskrit term *pramāṇa* (*aḷavai* in Tamil) is the instrument of "cognition" or "means of valid knowledge." The necessity of establishing what counted as a means of valid knowledge (*pramāṇa*) was considered an essential prerequisite by all schools of Indian philosophy. The usual list in Sanskrit consists of 1) *pratyakṣa* or perception, 2) *anumāna* or inference, 3) *śabda* or authoritative verbal testimony, 4) *upamāna* or analogy, 5) *arthāpatti* or non-cognition, and 6) *anupalabdhi* or presumption/postulation. Different schools recognize a varying number of

VERSE 34

iṭittu miṉṉi iruṇṭu mēkam eḻunta pōtuitu peyyumeṉṟu
aṭutta tumakil cantam unti alaittu vārpuṇal āṟukoṇṭu
eṭuttu vantiṭa mālva raikkaṇ iruntu koṇṭal corintatu eṉṟu
muṭitta tumivai kāṭci aṉṟuaṉu māṉam eṉṟu moḻintiṭē.

[This verse reinforces "inference" as a valid way of knowing].

TRANSLATION:

The knowledge [you deduce] that "it is going to rain" (*itu peyyum eṉṟu aṭutta tum*) when you see the formation (*eḻunta pōtuitu*) of dark clouds (*iruṇṭu mēkam*), lightning (*miṉṉi*), and thunder (*iṭittu*), [or] when you see sandalwood and akilwood logs (*akil cantam*) being pushed by waves in the river (*unti alaittu vārpuṇal āṟukoṇṭu*), then it will occur to you that (*uṭittatum*) there was heavy rain (*koṇṭal corintatu eṉṟu*) along the hillside (*mālvaraik kaṇeṭuttu vantiṭa*). You will declare so [what occurred to you] (*moḻintiṭē ivai*) not because of direct perception (*kāṭci aṉṟu*) but only by inference (*aṉumāṉam eṉṟu*).[365]

VERSE 35

kāṇṭa lēaṉu māṉam āvatum kāṭci muṉṉatum kāṭciyēl
pūṇṭa pūta uṭampiṉ uḷḷeḻu pōtam eṉkoṭu kaṇṭaṉai

---

*pramāṇa*s. See JOHNSON 2009:241. Śaiva Siddhānta accepts *Śiva cit-śakti* (*civa ciṟcatti* in Tamil) as the only valid means of knowledge, though as secondary means, it accepts the traditional first three (in Tamil)—perception (*piratyaṭcam*), inference (*aṉumāṉam*), and authoritative testimony (*captam*) as dictated by the Āgamas. The school considers the *pramāṇa*s (*aḷavai*) to be a subset of *civa ciṟcatti.* See DEVASENAPATHI 1981:42. The Śaiva Siddhānta position on valid knowledge may be stated as explained by Devasenapathi. "*Pramāṇa* may be viewed under two aspects: *pramāṇa* that is helped and *pramāṇa* that helps; *pramāṇa* that is helped has removable defilement. Therefore, it is *jīva cit-śakti* which is favored with the grace of Śiva. The *pramāṇa* that helps is *Śiva cit- śakti*, which is engaged in removing the defilement that veils the soul's *cit- śakti*. See DEVASENAPATHI 1966:20.

[365] The suggestion here is that although one does not actually "witness" a severe thunderstorm on the hillside, by looking at the flooding river carrying uprooted trees, one could "infer" the occurrence of a storm.

māṇṭa vāyiṉ maṉaṅkoḷ ñāṉam uṇarnta tumaṉu māṉameṉṟu
īṇṭu pūtam iyaintatu ivvuṭal eṉpatu eṉpira māṇamē.

[The poet expands on the previous verse on inference as a valid means of knowing. This verse emphasizes that inference is not based on perception, and inference as a way of knowing stands on its own merit. It is by inference we say that bodies result from the union of the elements].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that what was inferred (*aṉumāṉam āvatum*) was perceived [in fact, part of perception] (*kāṇṭalē*) because it had been previously perceived (*kāṭci muṉṉatum kāṭciyēl*), [then, how do you explain] the evolution of intelligence (*uḷḷeḻu pōtam*) in the body (*uṭampiṉ*), which originates from the union of the [four] elements (*pūṇṭa pūta*)? [Definitely], not by perception (*eṉkoṭu kaṇṭaṉai*). Knowledge (*maṉaṅkoḷ ñāṉam*) perceived through [other] sense organs (*māṇṭa vāyiṉ*) [366] is knowledge by inference only.[367] The realization (*uṇarntatum*) that this body (*ivvuṭal eṉpatu*) appears because of the union of elements (*īṇṭu pūtam*) is also by inference (*aṉumāṉam eṉṟu*). This is my conviction (*eṉ piramāṇamē*).[368]

VERSE 36

paḻuti lāmaṟai kaṇṭa nūlpaḻutu iṉṟi uṇṭatu pāriṉmēl
moḻivar cōtiṭam muṉṉi iṉṉatu muṭiyum eṉpatu muṉṉamē
aḻivi lātatu kaṇṭa ṉamavai aṉṟi yumcila āka maṅkaḷiṉ
eḻuti yōrpaṭi ēṉṟu koṇṭuiru niti eṭuppatum eṇṇiṭē.

---

[366] In the context of the verse, *māṇṭa vāy* is translated as a sense organ.

[367] In other words, our knowledge that a sense organ such as the ear can "hear" is by inference only because the hearing process cannot be visually perceived and understood. The poet tries to illustrate that no one could visually perceive the sound waves entering the ear to understand the process of hearing.

[368] A clever use of the words by the poet. This could also be translated as "It is my way of knowing."

[This verse highlights the importance of testimony as a way of knowing. Testimony (the Āgamas) is the third and the last means of knowledge recognized by the Śaiva Siddhānta school. The poet makes it clear that perception and inference are not the only means of knowing. Testimony is also an equally valid way of knowing. This is a rebuttal to the Lokāyata, who holds that perception is the only way of knowing].

TRANSLATION:

Impeccable Vedic scriptures and other treatises (*paḻuti ilā maṟai kaṇṭa nūl*) state the truth without fault (*paḻutu iṉṟi uṇṭatu*). In this world (*pāriṉmēl*), we have seen that (*kaṇṭaṉam avai*) what the astrological manuals stated (*cōtiṭam moḻivar*)[369] in the past regarding the future (*muṉṉi iṉṉatu muṭiyum eṉpatu muṉṉamē*) have come true (*aḻivilātatu*). Understand that (*eṇṇiṭē*) people following the clues given in some Āgamas (*ākamaṅkaḷiṉ eḻutiyōr paṭi*) make the effort (*ēṉṟu koṇṭu*) and dig the earth to find the treasures (*iruniti eṭuppatum*).[370]

VERSE 37

pūtam āṉavai nittam eṉṟu pukaṉṟatu eṉṉai? urukkaḷāy
āta lōṭuaḻi vākum ātaliṉ ākkuvōr avar vēṇṭiṭum
kāta lōṭu[371] kaṭāti maṇkoṭu iyaṟṟu vōruḷar kaṇṭaṉam
cīta nīril[372] eḻunta koppuḷ nikaḻnta mārutac ceykaiyē.

[This verse concerns itself with the elements and the efficient cause of creation.

---

[369] In Tamil, the word *cōtiṭam* means both astronomy and astrology. Often they are used interchangeably. (Tamil Lexicon, p. 1668).

[370] The reference to the Āgamas here is to any treatise which might have a hidden clue to certain buried treasures. People studying these treatises do trust the veracity of the treatises and dig the earth to find these treasures. The poet makes a point that written testimonies do offer valid means of knowledge. There is no particular reference to such a treatise by name.

[371] The word *kātalōṭu* means “with love”. The word appears to be a misfit in this context. It could have been added for poetic reasons, just for rhyming.

[372] The word means cool water from the cloud, i.e. rain water.

The poet makes a point that when the union of the elements creates forms, they change or perish altogether; there must be an agent that precipitated these changes. Just as pots cannot appear on their own without a potter, creation of the world needs an efficient cause].

TRANSLATION:

Why do you say (*pukaṉṟatu eṉṉai*) that the elements are permanent (*pūtam āṉavai nittam eṉṟu*) [imperishable]? When the elements unite (*urukkaḷāy*), forms are created and also destroyed (*ātal ōṭu aḻivākum*). Therefore (*ātaliṉ*), we need an agent to create (*ākkuvōr avar vēṇṭiṭum*), just as a potter is required (*iyaṟṟuvōr uḷar*) [to create] when we see (*kaṇṭaṉam*) several forms of pots (*kaṭāti*) appearing from the clay (*maṇkoṭu*) [in the potter's wheel]. [Furthermore] air bubbles (*koppuḷ*) [and foam] formed (*eḻunta*) in the rainwater (*cīta nīril*) [do not form on their own; they are] caused [created] by air (*mārutac ceykaiyē*).

VERSE 38

nīriṉ vantueḻu koppuḷ nīratu vāy eḻum nikaḻ pūtamum
ōriṉ vēṟuuṇarvāy eḻā avai pūta māki utittiṭum
tēriṉ nūṟuaṭai kāycē ṟintuavai cēra vēṟu civappueḻum
pāri ṉilpiri yātu punti paḻippu uṭampu kiṭakkavē.

[This verse and the next two underscore the principles of intelligence, an efficient cause and a first cause of creation].

TRANSLATION:

[You hold that] just as the bubbles appearing in water (*nīriṉ vantueḻu koppuḷ*) have the same nature as that of water (*nīratu vāy eḻum*), the body formed by the union of the elements (*pūtamum nikaḻ*) should have the same nature as the constituent elements (*pūtam āki utittiṭum*) but unlike consciousness, which is of a different nature (*vēṟu uṇarvāy eḻā avai*). [On the other hand] if you say it is [a phenomenon comparable to] when betel leaves (*nūṟu*), lime (*aṭai*) and areca nut

(*kāy*) are combined (*cēr̲intu avai*) [chewed together] a new red color appears (*civappue̲lum*)[373] that is dissimilar from the constituents (*cēra vēr̲u*). [You suggest that consciousness is produced from the union of elements and is dissimilar from the constituents]. Your views are flawed (*pa̲lippu*) because redness never leaves the betel quid (*n̲ilpiri yātu*), whereas when the consciousness (*punti*)[374] leaves [at death], the body is left behind (*uṭampu kiṭakkavē*).

VERSE 39

kūr̲u cērvaiyiṉ vanta pōtu civappu eṉumkuṇam oṉr̲umē
vēr̲u vēr̲u pulaṉ kuṇaṅkaḷ uṭar̲kaṇ vantu viḷaintatu eṉ?
nūr̲u kāyaṭai kūṭum vēr̲uoru vanta ṉāleṉa nōkkinī
tēr̲u, pūta ceyar̲kum vēṇṭum oruttaṉ eṉr̲u teḷintiṭē.

[This is the second of the three verses that describe the principles of intelligence, an efficient cause, and a first cause for creation].

TRANSLATION:

When betel leaves and areca nut are chewed together (*kūr̲u cērvaiyiṉ vanta pōtu*), only one quality (*eṉum kuṇam oṉr̲umē*) of redness (*civappu*) appears. However, the union of elements results (*viḷaintatu*) in several kinds of (*vēr̲u vēr̲u*) senses and sense organs in the body (*uṭar̲kaṇ vantu*) with different qualities (*pulaṉ kuṇaṅkaḷ*). Why (*eṉ*)? [How do you explain that?]. Understand clearly (*teḷintiṭē*) that just as you need (*eṉr̲u nōkki nī*) an external [human] agent (*vēr̲uoru vanta ṉāleṉa*) to chew the betel leaves (*aṭai*), areca nut (*kāy*), and lime (*nūr̲u*) together to create (*kūṭum*) the red saliva; [similarly], for intelligence to be created

---

[373] In India, and other parts of South Asia and Southeast Asia, betel leaves are chewed together in a wrapped package along with the areca nut (which, by association, is often inaccurately called the "betel nut") and mineral slaked lime. Tobacco is sometimes added. When chewed together, the combination, called "betel quid," stains the saliva red.

[374] The author uses three different words (*ar̲ivu*, *punti*, and *uṇarvu*) to represent consciousness although the words have different shades of meaning.

from the union of elements (*pūta ceyaṟkum*) you need (*vēṇṭum*) an agent (*oruttaṉ*).

VERSE 40

āṉa aimpoṟi uṇṭi nittirai accam maituṉam ātiyāy
ūṉil vantiṭum muṉpu ilātavai eṉṟu raikkiṉ, ulūtaipōl
vāṉiṉ vantiṭum mātar āṇ ali āki māṉuṭar ātiyāy
yōṉi paṉmaiyum iṉṟu pūtam uṟumpu ṇarccior taṉmaiyē.

[This verse continues the discussion].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that (*eṉṟuraikkiṉ*) just as the silk appears from a spider (*ulūtaipōl*), [so do] the five senses (*aimpoṟi*), [the experiences of] hunger (*uṇṭi*), sleep (*nittirai*), fear (*accam*), and sexual desire (*maituṉam*) appear in the body (*ūṉil vantiṭum*) without any first cause (*muṉpu ilātavai*), then women (*mātar*), men (*āṇ*) and eunuchs (*ali*) should all appear from the sky (*vāṉiṉ vantiṭum*) without any human agent (*māṉuṭar ātiyāy*). [Furthermore], because the union of the elements is of the same nature (*or taṉmaiyē*) the resulting creation should be the same (*pūtam uṟum puṇarcci*), but there are multiple forms (*yōṉi paṉmaiyum*)[375]. [Hence, your arguments are untenable].

VERSE 41

aintu nāṅkuoru mūṉṟu iraṇṭuṭaṉ oṉṟa tāyuṭa laṅkaḷiṉ
vanti ṭāuṇarvu inti yaṅkaḷum vaṉṉa paṉmaiyum iṉmaiyām
punti yōṭiya vaṉṉa pōka kuṇaṅkaḷ pūta puṇarccitāṉ
tanti ṭātuivai pētam āyiṭa vanta vā, viṉai tantavā.

[This verse supports the law of karma].

[375] There are several species in creation such as humans, animals, and plants.

TRANSLATION:

[In this world], different forms of beings (*uṭalaṅkaḷiṉ*) have different kinds of senses; some have five kinds (*aintu*), some four (*nāṅku*), some three (*mūṉṟu*), some two (*iraṇṭu*) and others just one (*oṉṟatāy*).[376] Therefore, there is plurality (*vaṉṉa paṉmaiyum*) and there are differences in sense organs (*intiyaṅkaḷum*) and sense perception (*vantiṭā uṇarvu*) [among them]. The mere union of the elements (*pūta puṇarccitāṉ*) cannot create (*tantiṭātu*) learning (*punti yōṭiya vaṉṉa*), enjoyment (*iṉmaiyām*), and attributes (*kuṇaṅkaḷ*). These perceived (*vanta vā*) differences (*ivai pētam āyiṭa*) are due to karma (*viṉai tantavā*) [their past deeds].

VERSE 42

aṟivu pūtamatu eṉṉil vēṟu puṟattu aṟintamai kaṇṭilam
ceṟivu tāṉuṭa lattu eṉilcavam āṉa pōtuuṭal tērumō
kuṟiko ḷātuuṭal vāyu vāṉatu kūṭi ṭāmaiyiṉ eṉṉilnī
piṟi tarātuuyir niṟka ñāṉam uṟakkam eṉpiṟa vātatē.

[This verse denies the theory that the elements constitute intelligence].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that the elements represent intelligence (*aṟivu pūtamatu eṉṉil*)[377] [matter creates the mind], we do not perceive (*kaṇṭilam*) any intelligence in the elements (*vēṟu puṟattu aṟintamai*) [of earth, water, fire and air]. If you suggest (*eṉil*) that when the elements unite (*ceṟivu*) in the body (*tāṉ uṭalattu*) [mind is created], [how do you explain that] there is no intelligence (*kuṟi koḷātu*) in a dead

[376] The five sensory perceptions are touch, taste, smell, sight, and hearing. From vegetation to insects, to animals, and to human beings, the senses vary in number.

[377] The poet uses the words *aṟivu*, *ñāṉam* and *uṇarvu* interchangeably to represent "consciousness," "intelligence and/or "knowledge" without making an attempt to distinguish their intrinsic differences.

body (*cavam āṉa pōtu uṭal*)? You may suggest (*eṉṉil nī*) [that when one dies], life escapes from the body (*uṭal*) in the form of air (*vāyu kūṭiṭāmaiyiṉ*). If that is the case, when one is asleep (*uṟakkam*) life has not left the body (*piṟitarātu uyir niṟka*), but this intelligence (*ñāṉam*) does not manifest itself (*eṉpiṟa vātatē*) [is not conscious] why? [So your suggestion that the union of elements produce intelligence is not tenable].

VERSE 43

aṟivu uṭaṟkuṇam eṉṉil āṉaiyatu āti antam eṟumpatām
uṟum, uṭaṟperi tāṉa varṟil utitti ṭumperi tākavē,
ciṟuvu ṭaṟceṟi ñāṉa mumciṟi tāyi ṭumpari ṇāmamum
peṟum, uṭaṟciṟi tāvatu eṉ, peri tāvatu eṉcila pēciṭē.

[This verse refutes the idea that intelligence is the product of the body].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that intelligence is a function of the body (*aṟivu uṭaṟ kuṇam eṉṉil*), there are many forms (*āti antam uṟum*) such as an elephant (*āṉaiyatu*) and an ant (*eṟumpatām*). [If intelligence depends on the size of the body], then a big body [*elephant*] (*uṭaṟperi tāṉa varṟil*) should have much greater intelligence (*utittiṭum peri tākavē*) and a small body [ant] (*ciṟu vuṭaṟ*) should have much less intelligence (*ceṟi ñāṉamum ciṟitāyiṭum*). [However, that is not the case]. A big elephant (*peritāvatu*) has much less intelligence (*pariṇāmamum peṟum*) [compared to a man], who has a much smaller body (*uṭaṟ ciṟitāvatu eṉ*). Explain (*eṉcila pēciṭē*)!

VERSE 44

pōta mummeli vāki yummali pūtam āṉavai kūṭalil
pēta mōṭu peruttu uṭaṟkaḷ ciṟutta peṟṟimai eṉṟiṭil
ōtu ṭaṟperi tāṉ vumciṟitu āyiṭā ciṟitu āṉavum
nīṭiyil peritu āyiṭā muṉam uḷḷa taṉmaiyiṉ nīṭumē.

[This verse refutes the idea that the union of the elements creates the body and its intelligence. If the body is nothing but an aggregate of the constituent elements, then the body should not undergo any change and be the same from birth to death. That is not the case. The intelligence of a body is not correlated with its size. In a previous verse, the poet gave an example to establish this point. In this world, big bodies decay over time and become smaller, but small bodies can get bigger over time. The poet tells the Lokāyata that his argument that the body and its intelligence are created by the union of just the elements is not valid].

TRANSLATION:

When the elements combine (*pūtam āṉavai kūṭalil*), if you say (*eṉṟiṭil*) that there is more intelligence when the elements are subtle (*pōta mum meli vāki yum*), and less intelligence results when the elements are gross (*mali pēta mōṭu*), a large body should never get smaller (*uṭaṟ peritāṉvum ciṟitu āyiṭā*) and a small body should never get larger (*ciṟituāṉavum peritu āyiṭā*). [Furthermore], the order of the world (*nīṭiyil*) demonstrates the fact (*uḷḷa taṉmaiyiṉ nīṭumē*) that large bodies could have low intelligence (*peruttu uṭaṟkaḷ ciṟutta peṟṟimai*).

VERSE 45

iyalpu kāṇivai eṉṉiṉ vēṟicai peṇṇoṭu āṇiru taṉmaiyām
ceyalkō ḷāivar ceyti kāraṇam āka vantu ceṉippateṉ
iyalpa tāmuṭal pūta kāriyam āva tumillai yākumāl
mayala tāmviṉai yāl oruttaṉ vakutta taṉmaiyiṉ vantatē.

[This verse reiterates the view that there is more to the creation of life than just the union of the elements].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that everything in this world is the nature of the union of the elements

[and not due to karma] (*iyalpu kāṇivai eṉṉiṉ*), how do you explain the creation of two forms (*iru taṉmaiyām*) of women and men (*peṇṇoṭu āṇ*) from the same union (*vēṟicai*) of the elements? Why should they [men and women] (*ivar*) act together to produce (*ceyti kāraṇam āka vantu*) a life (*ceyalkōḷā ceṉippateṉ*)? The body (*uṭal*) does not appear (*āvatum illai*) just by the nature of the elements (*iyalpa tām pūta kāriyam*). It is the result of the law of karma (*viṉai yāl*) designed (*vakutta taṉmaiyiṉ vantatē*) by god (*oruttaṉ*). You are in a stupor (*mayala tām*) [to believe otherwise].

VERSE 46

kāra ṇamavai eṉṟatu eṉṉai kaṭāti pōlnikaḷ kāriyam
nēr aṇaintu camaintu niṉṟuṭum eṉpa tumatu nērkilōm
pōr aṇaintiṭum oṉṟoṭu oṉṟu poruntu māyiṉ varuntiyum
nīr aṇaintuoru tīyiṉ niṉṟatu kaṇṭa tāyiṉ nikaḷttiṭē.

[This verse refutes the argument that the distinction of men and women with different natures is caused by the union of the elements. The nature of each of the four elements is very different. Life cannot be created just by their union. The poet makes it clear that union of the elements is not a sufficient cause to produce a life].

TRANSLATION:

We refute (*nērkilōm*) your suggestion (*eṉṟatui*) that union of the elements is the reason (*kāraṇam avai*) for creation (*kāriyam*) [of men and women] just as pots of different shapes appear (*kaṭāti pōlnikaḷ*) [from the clay in a potter's wheel], which in turn unite (*nēr aṇaintu*) to create more forms (*camaintu niṉṟuṭum eṉpa tumatu*). Two dissimilar elements (*pōr aṇaintiṭum*) cannot combine to form a union (*oṉṟoṭu oṉṟu poruntu māyiṉ*). Tell me (*nikaḷttiṭē*) if you have seen (*kaṇṭa tāyiṉ*) fire coexisting with water (*nīr aṇaintu oru tīyiṉ niṉṟatu*).

VERSE 47

pūtam mēvu puṇarcci yēpuri kāya kāraṇam ākumēl

kātal āṇoṭu peṇṇum mēvu puṇarcci kāraṇam āvateṉ
āti yēula kattil āṇoṭu peṇṇu māyaṇai kāriyam
nātaṉ nāyaki yōṭu kūṭi nayanta kāraṇam eṉparē.

[This verse emphasizes that the physical relationship between men and women is not sufficient for the creation of a life].

TRANSLATION:

Having said that the union of elements (*pūtam mēvu puṇarcciyē puri*) is the reason (*kāraṇam ākumēl*) for the appearance of a body (*kāya*), now why do you say (*āvateṉ*) that the loving physical union (*kātal mēvu puṇarcci*) between a man and a woman (*āṇoṭu peṇṇum*) is the reason (*kāraṇam*) [for the appearance of a life]? From time eternal (*āti yēula kattil*), the reason (*kāraṇam eṉparē*) women and men (*āṇoṭu peṇṇumāy*) unite physically (*aṇai kāriyam*) is because [they emulate] god's (*nātaṉ*) pleasurable union (*kūṭi nayanta*) with his consort (*nāyaki yōṭu*).

VERSE 48

kantam vemmai kalanti ṭumpuṉal kaṉmam eṉceytatu eṉṟaṉai
canta ṉamtaḷal cāra nīriru taṉmai yuṟṟiṭumāṟu atuōr
tanta kaṉmam iraṇṭu aṇaintu tarumcu kattoṭu tukkamum
cinti yāeḷu cīvaṉ uṟṟiṭum vēṟu uṭaṟkuilai tēṟiṭē.

[This verse refutes the argument against the law of karma. The poet challenges the Lokāyata. "You said that water has a cool nature when associated with sandalwood [paste] and has a warm nature when it is associated with fire. You ask how karma produces two different opposing natures. Therefore, you deny the law of karma. In your analogy, one substance has two opposing properties. Similarly, the manifested polarity of pleasure and pain is the karmic result due to one entity, the soul, and has no bearing on the body"].

TRANSLATION:

When water (*puṉal*) combines with fire (*taḻal cāra*), heat (*vemmai*) is produced, but when mixed (*kalanti ṭum*) with sandalwood (*cantaṉam*), a different (*atu ōr*) cool fragrance (*kantam*) results. [You ask] what did karma do (*kaṉmam eṉceytatu eṉṟaṉai*) to make water have two properties (*nīr iru taṉmai yuṟṟiṭumāṟu*)? Karma produces two different results (*tanta kaṉmam iraṇṭu aṇaintu tarum*). Learn that (*tēṟiṭē*) pleasure and pain (*cukattoṭu tukkamum*) affect only the soul (*cinti yāeḻu cīvaṉ uṟṟiṭum*) and not the body (*vēṟu uṭaṟkuilai*).

VERSE 49

iṉpam eyti iruntu nīviṉai illai iṅkuiyalpu eṉṟiṭil
tuṉpam eytiṭu vāṉeṉ maṟṟitu colli ṭāycola vallaiyēl
muṉpu ceytiṭu kaṉmam eṉṟuaṟi kaṉma mummutal vaṉaṟintu
aṉpi ṉāluṟu vikkum appayaṉ āṅku amaippoṭu anātiyē.

[This verse establishes the law of karma. Because of it, the actions of the previous life appear as pain and pleasure in this life and that is determined by the grace of god. This law and the souls have been connected eternally].

TRANSLATION:

You enjoy the pleasures of this world (*iṉpam eyti iruntu*) and still you (*nī*) say that it is not the karmic law (*viṉai illai*), but it is the nature of the world (*iṅku iyalpu eṉṟiṭil*). [If that is so], what is the reason for anyone to experience pain (*tuṉpam eytiṭu vāṉeṉ*)? You cannot give a proper reason (*cola vallaiyēl*). Learn that (*eṉṟuaṟi*) it is due to the karma of previous births (*muṉpu ceytiṭu kaṉmam*). Because of the grace (*aṉpiṉāl*) of the first cause [god] (*mutalvaṉ aṟintu*), lives are formed (*uṟu vikkum*) and the effects of karma (*appayaṉ kaṉma mum*) are manifested (*āṅku amaippoṭu*) eternally (*anātiyē*). Do not tell me otherwise (*maṟṟitu colli ṭāy*)!

VERSE 50

anāti yēlamaivu iṉṟu eṉiṉmalam māyai kaṉmam aṇuCivaṉ

anāti, kaṉmam aṇukkaḷ ceyya aṟintu kaṉmam uṭaṟceyā,
anāti kāriya mām uṭalkaḷ acēta ṉamaṇaiyā aṟintu
anāti āti amaikka vēṇṭum amaippi ṉōṭum anātiyē.

[This verse refutes the Lokāyata stand that god is not required for the functioning of the universe].

TRANSLATION:

If you hold that just as karma is eternal (*anāti yēl*), there is no need [for a god] to actuate it (*amaivu iṉṟu eṉiṉ*), [learn that] impurities (*malam*), māyā (*māyai*), karma (*kaṉmam*), soul (*aṇu*) and Śiva (*civaṉ*) are all eternal [entities] (*anāti*). When the souls reap the karma (*kaṉmam aṇukkaḷ ceyya*), the karmic effects (*kaṉmam*) will not reach out to the souls (*aṇukkaḷ*) to give them forms (*uṭaṟceyā*). The eternally appearing bodies (*anāti kāriya mām uṭalkaḷ*) are unintelligent (*acētaṉam*) and do not know how to merge with the souls (*aṇaiyā aṟintu*). An eternal agent (*anāti*) is required to unite (*amaikka vēṇṭum*) [souls with the bodies]. This is an eternal process (*amaippi ṉōṭum anātiyē*).

VERSE 51

kāṇō ṇākara ṇaṅka ḷukkuuyir kaṇṭi ṭāmaiyiṉ iṉṟeṉil
kāṇu mōkaṭam kaṇṭa kaṇṇiṉaik kaṇṭu niṟpatum kaṇṇatē
kāṇo ṇātuuyir tāṉum ippaṭik kaṇṭi ṭumkara ṇaṅkaḷaik
kāṇo ṇākara ṇaṅka ḷukkuuyir uṇmai yāvatum kaṇṭiṭē.

[This verse rejects the Lokāyata concept of “no soul.” Just because the sense organs that provide intelligence cannot perceive the soul, the existence of soul cannot be negated].

TRANSLATION:

You say that because the soul (*uyir*) cannot be perceived (*kaṇṭi ṭāmaiyiṉ*) as an

object by the sense organs (*karaṇaṅkaḷukku*), there is no soul (*iṉreṉil*). It is the eye (*kaṇṇatē*) that perceives objects (*kaṇṭu niṟpatum*). An eye can see the body (*kaṭam*) but can the body see (*kāṇumō*) the eye that perceived it (*kaṭam kaṇṭa kaṇṇiṉai*)?[378] Similarly, the soul (*uyir tāṉum*) is an instrument of intelligence and knows the function (*ippaṭik kaṇṭiṭum*) of the sense organs (*karaṇaṅkaḷaik*). However, the sense organs (*karaṇaṅkaḷukku*) will never know the soul. [Therefore], understand (*kaṇṭiṭē*) the truth (*uṇmai yāvatum*) that there is a soul (*uyir*).

VERSE 52

aṅki yāṉatu tāṉum oṉṟai aṇaintu niṉṟu nikaḻntiṭum
paṅki yātuuyir tāṉum ippaṭip paṟṟi yallatu niṉṟiṭātu
eṅku mārtayi lattai uṇṭueḻu tīpa māṉatu erintiṭum
aṅka tāmuṭalniṉṟu kaṉmam arunti āruyir āvatē.

[The poet explains the nature of the soul. The soul cannot appear by itself; it needs a substrate just as fire can be perceived only when an object is being ignited].

TRANSLATION:

Fire (*aṅki yāṉatu*) can manifest itself (*niṉṟu nikaḻntiṭum*) only with another object (*tāṉum oṉṟai aṇaintu*). So is the case with the soul (*uyir tāṉum ippaṭi*), and it cannot manifest itself (*paṅki yātu*) without attaching itself to the body (*paṟṟi yallatu niṉṟiṭātu*). The wick of a lamp (*eḻu tīpa māṉatu*) will show light (*erintiṭum*) because of the oil it has absorbed (*tayilattai uṇṭu*). Similarly, the soul (*āruyir*) will exist (*aṅka āvatē*) with the body (*tām uṭal niṉṟu*) and experience (*arunti*) the results of its karma (*kaṉmam*).

---

[378] It is interesting to note that the word *kaṭam* means both a pot and a body. So the question could be rephrased as "An eye can see the pot, but can the pot see the eye that perceived it?"

VERSE 53

aṟivu tāṉuṭa lattiṉ vēṟatu vāy iṟantu piṟantiṭiṉ
aṟivu muṉpuḷatu iṅku vantum aṟinti ṭāmaiyatu iṉṟeṉiṉ
aṟivai yōkaṉa vattu nīnaṉa vattai aṉṟu utarattuiruntu
aṟiyum avvaṟi vōma yakkaṟivu āta lālaṟi yātukāṇ.

[This verse describes the dual state of "the soul" or "consciousness," and the poet uses the word *aṟivu* to describe it, which could also mean knowledge and/or intelligence. Anticipating the question "why the soul does not remember its past when it is reborn in another body," the poet compares it to the dream state when the dreamer is not aware of the fact that it is a dream. Similarly, the soul in its present body does not recall its previous life].

TRANSLATION:

[You may ask that] if intelligence (*aṟivu*) is apart from the body (*tāṉ uṭalattiṉ vēṟatuvāy*), and [If you say that] as the body goes through death (*iṟantu*) and rebirth (*piṟantiṭiṉ*), then the intelligence of the previous life (*aṟivu muṉpuḷatu*) does not appear (*aṟinti ṭāmaiyatu iṉṟeṉiṉ*) in the present life (*iṅku vantum*) just as when you are dreaming (*kaṉa vattu*), you think of the dream as real (*nīnaṉa vattai aṉṟu*) and do not realize (*aṟivai*) that it is a dream. [Also,] the intelligence you had (*aṟiyum avvaṟi*) when you were [a fetus] in your mother's womb (*utarattu iruntu*) was non-intelligence (*mayakka aṟivu*) [and different from your intelligence now]. Therefore, (*ātalāl*) learn that non-intelligence is part of the soul (*aṟiyātu kāṇ*)!

VERSE 54

iṟanti ṭumaṟi vēpi ṟantiṭum eṉpatu iṅkuicai yātueṉiṉ
uṟaṅki ṭumpoḻutu iṉṟi niṉṟuuṇarvu iṅku utittiṭum āṟatōr
piṟanta ivvuṭal pōka vēṟuṭal piṉpu vantamai pēciṭiṉ
maṟanti ṭumkaṉa vattil vēṟuṭal vanta vāṟu matittiṭē.

[This verse continues the discussion and offers further clarification. The migration of the soul from one body to another but without its memory of the past life is

similar to one being unaware of one's true identity during sleep].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that the intelligence of a dead person (*iṟantiṭum aṟivē*) will be born again [in another body] (*piṟantiṭum eṉpatu*), it is not possible (*iṅku icaiyātu*) because (*eṉiṉ*) when we sleep (*uṟaṅkiṭum poḻutu*), we are not conscious (*uṇarvu iṉṟi*), but on waking up [the consciousness] returns (*iṅku utittiṭum*). If you ask (*pēciṭiṉ*) how the body that we are born with leaves [dies] (*piṟanta ivvuṭal pōka*) and appears again as another body (*vēṟuṭal piṉpu vantamai*), it is similar to the memory lost during sleep (*maṟantiṭum kaṉavattil*); [then] consider that (*matittiṭē*) it is similar to (*āṟatōr*) getting a new body (*vēṟuṭal vanta vāṟu*).

VERSE 55

karaṇam vāyu viṭattu aṭaṅka aṭaṅki vantueḻu kāriyam
maraṇa māṉa iṭattu maṟṟivai māyntu piṉpu varumceyal
kiraṇa mārkalai keṭṭu utippa iṟappi ṉōṭu piṟappaiyum
taraṇi yōrkaḷ matikku uraippar uyirkkum ippaṭic cāṟṟiṭē.

[The theme from the previous verse continues. Birth, death, and re-birth are similar to a conscious person losing consciousness and regain consciousness or to the waxing and waning of the moon].

TRANSLATION:

When a man dies (*maraṇa māṉa*), his five senses (*karaṇam*) also perish (*aṭaṅka*) with the life-breath (*vāyu viṭattu*), and they function [again] (*kāriyam*) when he is re-born (*aṭaṅki vantueḻu*). It is the same as (*maṟṟivai*) regaining consciousness (piṉpu *varumceyal*) after one has fainted (*māyntu*).The worldly people say that (*taraṇi yōrkaḷ uraippar*) the waxing and waning of the moon (*kiraṇa mār kalai keṭṭu utippa*) is the moon's (*matikku*) birth and death (*iṟappi ṉōṭu piṟappaiyum*). Know that such is the case with the soul (*uyirkkum ippaṭic cāṟṟiṭē*) [and its cycles of birth and death].

VERSE 56

pūta māṉavai kāriyaṅkaḷ polintu maṉṉi aḻintiṭum
āta lāloru nātaṉ iṅkuḷaṉ eṉṟu aṟintukoḷ aiyaṉē
pēta māṉa kaṭāti maṇṇiṉil vanta vāṟu piṭittiṭil
kōti lāta kulāla ṉālvaru ceykai eṉṟu kuṟiparē.

[This verse reinforces the existence of god. Just as a potter is necessary to create a pot from clay, a god is necessary to create the orderly universe from the elements].

TRANSLATION:

From all the elements you mentioned (*pūta māṉavai*), all objects have appeared (*kāriyaṅkaḷ polintu*). After staying [for a while] (*maṉṉi*), they die (*aḻintiṭum*). Therefore (*ātalāloru*), Sir (*aiyaṉē*), learn that (*eṉṟu aṟintukoḷ*) a creator is required [to sustain this process] (*nātaṉ iṅkuḷaṉ*). It is to be observed (*eṉṟu kuṟiparē*) that just as different kinds (*pēta māṉa*) of pots (*kaṭāti*) from clay (*maṇṇiṉil*) are made (*piṭittiṭil*) by the acts (*ṉālvaru ceykai*) of a faultless potter, [so too, god is required to create and maintain this world] (*kōtilāta kulāla*).[379]

VERSE 57

vētaṉ nāraṇaṉāra ṇamaṟi yāvi ḻupporuḷ pētaipāl
tūta ṉāyiru kālnaṭantiṭu tōḻaṉ vaṉmaicey toṇṭaṉukku
āta lālaṭi yārka ḻukkueḷi yāṉ aṭikkama laṅkaḷ nī
kātalāl aṇai īṇṭaṉ vēṇṭiṉa immai yētarum kaṇṭiṭē.

[According to the poet, Śiva is beyond comprehension to both Brahmā and Viṣṇu; yet, he is so compassionate towards his devotees that he would act as an

[379] It appears as though the poet is referring to god when he says "*kōtilāta kulālaṉ,*"which means "a faultless potter."

emissary for them. He rewards his worshippers].

TRANSLATION:

[Śiva is the] greatest Being (*viḻupporuḷ*), not even comprehended (*aṟiyā*) by Brahmā (*vētaṉ*), Viṣṇu (*nāraṇaṉ*) and the Vedas (*āraṇam*). He is of easy access (*eḷiyāṉ*) to his devotees (*aṭiyārkaḷukku*). He walked twice (*iru kālnaṭantiṭu*) as an emissary (*tūtaṉāy*) between his devotee Vaṉtoṇṭar (*vaṉmaicey toṇṭaṉukku*) and the woman [he wanted to marry][380] (*pētai*). Therefore (*ātalāl*), if you keep his lotus feet (*aṭik kamalaṅkaḷ*) on your head and worship (*vēṇṭiṉa*) him with love (*kāta lāl*), you will be rewarded (*kaṇṭiṭē*) with all the pleasures (*immaiyē tarum*) in this world (*īṇṭaṉ*).

VERSE 58

poṅku lāvu maṇikka laṉkaḷ malampu kilkai porintiṭā
miṅku lāmiṭai yārkaḷ tāmula kattiṉ vēṭkai viṭumporuḷ
puṉpu lālmala mūtti rāti pocintu nāṟu pulaikkalam
eṉkō lāmivar mēlvi ḻuntatu ivaṟṟiṉ eṉpeṟa eṇṇiyē.

[This verse is a clear rebuttal to the Lokāyata view about the sensual desirability of female bodies and the carnal pleasures offered by them. The poet declares that beauty is only skin-deep].

TRANSLATION:

If an exquisite golden ornament (*poṅkulāvu maṇik kalaṉkaḷ*) is covered with dirt (*malam pukil*),[381] we do not [bring ourselves to] touch it (*kai porintiṭām*).

---

[380] The reference is to an incident described in the *Periya Purāṇam*, a Tamil-Classic hagiography by Cēkkiḻār (fl. circa 13th century CE) on the lives of Śaiva saints of South India. Śiva once acted as an emissary of Saint Cuntarar, also known as Vaṉtoṇṭar, and twice walked to the abode of Caṅkiliyār to convince her to marry Cuntarar MCGLASHAN 2006:284-285; VANMIKANATHAN 1985:138-139; MUTALIAR 1910:76; PIḶḶAI 1975:27.

[381] The word "*malam*" also refers to human excrement.

[Similarly,] women, with their attractive waists (*miṅ iṭaiyārkaḷ*), make themselves the objects of lust (*vēṭkai viṭumporuḷ*) of the world (*tāmula kattiṉ*), but they are [just an aggregate of] flesh, feces and urine (*pulāl mala mūttirāti*). Their bodies ooze out (*pocintu*) defilement (*pulaikkalam*) of bad odor (*nāṟu*). In this world (*iṅkulām*),[382] what benefits do you expect (*ivaṟṟiṉ eṉpeṟa eṇṇiyē*) by falling over such bodies (*ivar mēl viḻuntatu*)?

VERSE 59

tōl irattam iṟaicci mētai elumpu maccai cuvētanī
rālē ṭutta muṭaikku rampai aḻukki ṉōṭu puḻukkuḻām
nūlō ḻukkiṭu kōḻai yīral nuraikkum mūttira pāttiram
cēla ṭarttakaṇ ṇārka ḷeṉpatu tērma lattiraḷ tiṇṇamē.

[More graphic description of the revolting aspects of human anatomy is provided, clearly to provoke disgust at admiring the beauty of the female body].

TRANSLATION:

The human body (*kurampai*) with stench (*muṭai*) is [an aggregate of] skin (*tōl*), blood (*irattam*), flesh (*iṟaicci*), fat (*mētai*), bones (*elumpu*), bone marrow (*maccai*), semen (*cuvētanīr*), and liver (*īral*). It is a urinal (*mūttira pāttiram*) foaming (*nuraikkum*) with stringy phlegm (*nūl ōḻukkiṭu kōḻai*), full of filth (*aḻukki ṉōṭu*), and worms (*puḻukkuḻām*). To say (*eṉpatu*) [women are beautiful with] fish-like eyes (*cēl aṭartta kaṇṇārkaḷ*) is a falsehood (*tiṇṇamē*), [because] they are an aggregate of filth (*malat tiraḷ*).

VERSE 60

ācai yuṟṟuuḻal cūka raṅkaḷ acutta mēvi yaḷaintutiṉ
ṟēcu kittaṉa vāyi ṭumcukam ēḻai yōṭuuṟum iṉpamnī
māca taṟṟuoḷir nitta cutta vaḷamta rumcuka vārikāṇ

[382] The word "*kulām*" means "in this world" as well as "to enslave".

īca ṉukkaṭi maitti ṟattiṉ iyaintu nāmpeṟum iṉpamē.

[Carnal pleasures derived from union with women are fleeting in nature, while worshipping Śiva offers wealth of spiritual pleasure and permanent happiness].

TRANSLATION:

Just as wandering pigs (*uḻal cūkaraṅkaḷ*) driven by desire (*ācai yuṟṟu*) wallow in filth (*acuttamē aḻaintu*) and eat [filth] (*tiṉṟē*), and the little pleasure they get (*cukittaṉa vāyiṭum cukam*) is similar to [a person's] pleasure derived from union with a woman (*ēḻaiyōṭu uṟum iṉpam*). [Similarly] the pleasure we derive (*nāmpeṟum iṉpamē*) by becoming slaves to god (*īcaṉukk aṭimait tiṟattiṉ iyaintu*) who is untainted (*mācataṟṟu*) and illuminating (*oḷir nitta*) [is the source of the utmost] pure (*cutta*) wealth of happiness (*vaḻam tarum*).

VERSE 61

kurōta mēkuṇa māy iruntavar cānti naṉmai kurikkoḷār
arāka mēaṇai vārkaḷ acai aṟutta iṉpam aṟintiṭār
parāvu tēvar parāvu tūya parāpa raṉṉaṭi paṟṟinī
virāvi meyyil viṭāta iṉpam viḻainti ṭumitu meymmaiyē.

[If someone is entrenched in an emotion such as anger, that person will never understand the calm and serene state that could be realized by being at peace. Similarly, those who enslave themselves to carnal pleasure and passion will never understand the nature of permanent happiness one could have by being a devotee of Śiva].

TRANSLATION:

Those who are engulfed in anger (*kurōtamē kuṇamāy iruntavar*) will never know the benefits of [being in] peace (*cānti naṉmai kurikkoḷār*). Those who indulge in passion (*arākamē aṇaivārkaḷ*) will never know the joy of getting rid of passion (*acai aṟutta iṉpam aṟintiṭār*). If you (*nī*) hold on (*paṟṟi*) to the feet (*aṭi*) of the pure

(*tūya*) supreme god (*parāparaṉ*) and worship him (*parāvu*), whom the devas worship (*parāvu tēvar*), an unceasing [permanent] bliss (*viṭāta iṉpam*) will spring forth (*viḷaintiṭum*) in your body (*vir āvi meyyil*). This is the truth (*itu meymmaiyē*).

VERSE 62

kāma māti kuṇaṅka ḷaiccukam eṉṟu koṇṭaṉai kātalāl
tūmam āraḻal aṅki cītam malinta pōtu cukantarum
nāma mārtaru cītam vemmai nalinta pōtu tarumcukam
cēma mākiya iṉpa māmmiku teyva naṉṉeṟi cēravē.

[Pleasures and bodily comforts could be transient. Warmth in winter would be desirable, but a cooler environment would be more pleasing during the summer. Seeking Śiva, however, would offer permanent pleasure].

TRANSLATION:

You think (*koṇṭaṉai*) passion and [fulfillment of] other desires (*kāmamāti kuṇaṅkaḷai*) will make you happy (*ccukam eṉṟu*). [It is wrong]. When there is no warmth [in winter], (*cītam malinta pōtu*) fire with smoke (*tūmam āraḻal aṅki*) will provide comfort (*cukantarum*). When it is warm [in summer] (*vemmai nalinta pōtu*), cool water (*nāma mārtaru cītam*) [383] will give you pleasure (*tarumcukam*). If you seek pleasure (*iṉpam*) that lasts forever (*cēma mākiya*), seek Śiva (*teyva cēravē*) and [follow] the path of knowledge (*naṉṉeṟi*).

VERSE 63

paṭikkum nūlkaḷ civākamam pacu pāca mōṭu patittiṟam
eṭuttui yampuvatu īcaṉ vārkaḻal ētti ṭumtoḻil eṉṟumē
viṭuttiṭum poruḷ kāma mātikaḷ vēṇṭi ṭumporuḷ īṇṭu aruḷ
muṭittu mummalam viṭṭu niṉmala ṉōṭu niṉṟiṭal muttiyē.

---

[383] The word "*cītam*" means both "water" and "coldness." *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "cītam" (p. 1475)*. The poet cleverly uses the word "namesake" (*nāma mār*).

[This is the last closing verse addressing the Lokāyata school. As a Śaiva Siddhāntin, the poet lauds the spiritual attitude of the followers of Śiva and their lofty pursuits in studying the scriptures and the doctrines of the school. They shun indulgences in carnal pleasures and are focused on worshipping Śiva single-mindedly and in seeking salvation].

TRANSLATION:

[As the austere followers of Śiva,] we study books (*paṭikkum nūlkaḷ*), which are the Āgamas (*civākamam*). We discuss (*iyampuvatu*) the doctrines (*tiṟam*) involving god (*pati*), beings (*pacu*), and defilements (*pācam*). Extolling [worshipping] (*ēttiṭum*) the anklets (*kaḻal*) [feet] of Śiva (*īcaṉ*) is our uninterrupted task (*toḻil eṉṟumē*). We get rid of (*viṭuttiṭum*) things [emotions] (*poruḷ*) such as passion (*kāmam*). The thing (*poruḷ*) we long for (*vēṇṭiṭum*) in this world (*īṇṭu*) is Śiva's grace (*aruḷ*). Discarding the three impurities (*mummalam viṭṭu*)[384] and identifying ourselves with (*niṉṟiṭal*) the One who has no impurity (*niṉmalaṉōṭu*) is the ultimate realization (*muttiyē*).

4.2A SAUTRĀNTIKA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 64-94)

VERSE 64

nītiyār vēta nūliṉ neṟiyalā aṟaṅkaḷ nāḷum
ōtiōr aintu cīlam uṭaiyarāy uṭalam mūṭip
pōtinīḷ marattiṉ mēvu puttarnāl variṉum vaittuc
cātitāṉ ilāta koḷkaic cauttirān tikaṉmuṉ cāṟṟum.

---

[384] As mentioned in the introduction, Śaiva Siddhānta admits five eternal substances: *pati* (god), *pacu* (beings), *māyai* (the material cause, and what evolves from it), *Karumam* (good and bad deeds and their results), and *āṇavamalam* (the fundamental evil or defilement). The last three are grouped together, and called *pācam* or *bandham* (fetters) or *malam* (defilement). Thus, the three ontological categories recognized by the system are god, the selves, and the principles of bondage.

[Aruṇanti, the poet, now turns his attention to the Buddhist schools.[385] For some reason, the focus seems to be on one particular school, the Sautrāntika, and he mentions the other schools only in passing. As the protagonist (*pūrvapakṣin*), he characterizes the Buddhist as one who is covered in (ochre) robes, worships the Bodhi tree, and follows the five virtues.[386] The Sautrāntika school does not recognize caste distinctions].

TRANSLATION:

Every day they chant (*nāḷum ōti*) [religious hymns] not recognized by the Vedas (*neṟiyalā aṟaṅkaḷ vēta nūliṉ*), [which prescribe] the right conduct (*nītiyār*). They practice the five-fold virtues (*aintu cīlam uṭaiyarāy*) and cover their bodies [with ochre robes] (*uṭalam mūṭi*). They [worship] the tall Bodhi tree (*pōti nīḻ marattiṉ*). They are the Sautrāntika (*cauttirāntikaṉ*) whose principles do not recognize caste distinctions (*cātitāṉ ilāta koḷkai*). [They are] one of the four schools of Buddhism (*puttar nālvariṉum*) and they proclaim (*cāṟṟum*) thus.

VERSE 65

muḻutuṇarntu ulakil kōṟal mutaṟceyal muṉintu maṟṟum
paḻutilā aruḷiṉālē paratukka tukkaṉ ākit
toḻuvā ṉavarum pōṟṟat tolpiṭa kaṅka ḷāṉa
vaḻuvilā kamaṅkaḷ coṉṉa mātavaṉ nātaṉ āvāṉ.

[The Sautrāntika extols the virtues of the Buddha. He uses an epithet of Viṣṇu to describe the Buddha, praises his compassion towards all lives, how he assumes their distress and suffering and how he, the author of the canonical writings, is worthy of being worshipped by the celestial beings].

---

[385] The four principal schools of Buddhism are Sautrāntika, Vaibhāṣika, Mādhyamika, and Yōgācāra.

[386] The five-fold virtues/precepts (*pañca-śīla* in Sanskrit and *aintucīlam* in Tamil) are to abstain from harming a living being, taking anything not given, sexual misconduct, false speech, and intoxication. See POWERS 2000:160.

TRANSLATION:

Realizing everything in this world (*muḻutuṇarntu ulakil*), hating (*muṉintu*) crimes such as murder (*kōṟal mutaṟceyal*), [appropriating] with impeccable grace (*paḻutilā aruḷiṉālē*), the sufferings of others as his own (*paratukka tukkaṉ āki*), worshipped and praised (*toḻu pōṟṟa*) by celestial bodies (*vāṉavarum*), being the author of flawless Āgamas (*vaḻuvilā kamaṅkaḷ coṉṉa*) such as the Tripiṭaka (*tolpiṭa kaṅkaḷāṉa*),[387] [he] is the Supreme Being (*nātaṉ āvāṉ*), [he] is the god [the Buddha] (*mātavaṉ*).[388]

VERSE 66

maruviya aḻavai kāṭci māṉameṉṟu iraṇṭu ivaṟṟāl
karutiya poruḷkaḷ ñāṉ ñēyamāyk kaṇattiṟ paṅkam
varumuru aruvam vīṭu vaḻakkeṉa nāṉku atuākit
tarumavai oṉṟu iraṇṭāyt tāmvirintu eṭṭiṉ āmē.

[This verse elaborates on the Buddhist epistemology, which recognizes only two ways of knowing, perception, and inference. The doctrine of impermanence (*anitya* in Sanskrit) in Buddhism gave rise to the doctrine of momentariness (*kṣaṇavāda*-Sanskrit), which in turn follows from the doctrine of dependent origination (*pratītya-samutpāda*-Sanskrit). Whatever is born will also be destroyed and whatever may be destroyed cannot be thought to be permanent. Everything is impermanent, and everything is momentary].

TRANSLATION:

[The *Piṭaka* texts recognize only] two ways (*iraṇṭu*) of knowing (*aḻavai*), which are

---

[387] The canonical collections of Buddhist writings are often referred to as 'the three baskets' (*tri-piṭaka*): the basket of discipline, the basket of discourses, and the basket of further dharma.

[388] Mātavaṉ (Mādhava in Sanskrit) is an epithet of Viṣṇu. In this context the poet refers to the Buddha.

perception (*kāṭci*) and inference (*māṉam*)[389]. There are two things perceived by these (*ivaṟṟāl karutiya poruḷkaḷ*); [they are] the object perceived (*ñēyamāy*) and the knowledge [acquired about the object] (*ñāṉa*). They are conditioned to momentary changes (*kaṇattiṟ paṅkam varum*). They split into four (*nāṉku atu ākit*) as form (*uru*), formlessness (*aruvam*), release (*vīṭu*), and tradition (*vaḻakkeṉa*).[390] Each of them split again into two (*oṉṟu iraṇṭāyt tāmvirintu*) and become (*tarumavai*) eight (*eṭṭiṉ āmē*).

VERSE 67

uruiyal pūta mōṭuaṅku upātāṉa rūpa mākum
aruiyal cittam kaṉmam eṉṟuiraṇ ṭākum vīṭṭiṉ
maru iyal kuṟṟam kantam eṉavaḻaṅ kiṭumva ḻakkiṉ
iruiyal uḷḷa tōṭuaṅku illatām iyampum kālē.

[The poet explains the terse comment made in the previous verse. Each of the four entities mentioned are split into two, making an aggregate of eight, each of which is described].

TRANSLATION:

The explanation is thus (*iyampum kālē*): The nature of the form (*uruiyal*) will manifest as *pūtarūpam* (*pūta mōṭu*) and *upātāṉarūpam* (*upātāṉa rūpam*).[391] The nature of formlessness (*aruiyal*) will split into two (*eṉṟu iraṇṭākum*) as mind (*cittam*) and karma (*kaṉmam*). The nature (*iyal*) of salvation (*vīṭṭiṉ*) will be seen

---

[389] The poet has abbreviated the word *aṉumāṉam* to *māṉam*.

[390] The Tamil word "*vaḻakku*" has several meanings. To list a few: customs, manners, ancient practice, way, a legal case, and method. See *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "vaḻakku" (p. 3541).* To capture the sense of all these words, I have chosen the word "tradition" or "belief", depending on the context.

[391] *Pūtarūpam* (*bhūtarūpam*-Sanskrit) contains earth, water, fire, and air; *upātāṉarūpam* (*upādānarūpam*-Sanskrit) contains hardness, taste, smell, and color. When all these eight combine (*cuttāṭṭakam*), we get forms that are visible in nature. See *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "cuttāṭṭakam" (p. 1512)*.

as (*eṉa vaḻaṅkiṭum*) defilement (*kuṟṟam*) and *skandha* (*kantam*).[392] The two characteristics (*iruiyal*) of conventions/beliefs (*vaḻakkiṉ*) are true (*uḷḷa tōṭu aṅku*) and false belief (*illatām*).

VERSE 68

maṉpuṉal aṉalkāl pūtam valikantam iratam vaṉṉam
eṇtarum upātā ṉamtāṉ ivaiyiru nāṉkum kūṭi
uṇṭoru poruḷ urūpam uṟupulaṉ upāṅkam ōṭak
kaṇṭatu cittam kaṉmam naṉṟutītu eṉṟal kāṇē.

[The discussion from the previous verse continues].

TRANSLATION:

[The elements of] earth (*maṉ*), water (*puṉal*), fire (*aṉal*), and air (*kāl*) [constitute], the *pūtarūpam* (*pūtam*). Hardness (*vali*), smell (*kantam*), taste (*iratam*), and color (*vaṉṉam*) [constitute] the *upātāṉarūpam* (*upātāṉam*). When these two sets of four (*ivaiyiru nāṉkum*) unite (*kūṭi*), objects are produced (*uṇṭoru poruḷ urūpam*). Mind uses (*kaṇṭatu cittam*) the sense organs to realize the sensations (*uṟu pulaṉ upāṅkam ōṭa*). Karma [facilitates the mind in assessing] (*kaṉmam*) such sensations as good, or bad (*naṉṟu tītu eṉṟal kāṇē*).

VERSE 69

kuṟṟavīṭu arākam āti kuṇaṅkaḻaik kuṟaitta lākum
maṟṟavīṭu uruvam āti aintaiyum māyttāl ākum
coṟṟarum tokaitō ṭarcci mikutturai eṉṟu mūṉṟāy

---

[392] The poet uses the word *kantam* in two different senses. In this verse, the word refers to *pañcakantam* (*skandha*-Sanskrit). "*Skandha* [Sanskrit]: One of the five "aggregates" or components which collectively constitute the human individual." KEOWN 2004:270.The five *skandha*s in Sanskrit are form (*rūpa*), feelings (*vedanā*), perception (*saṃñā*), volitional factors (*saṃskāra*), and consciousness (*vijñāna*). The equivalent Tamil words are *uruvam*, *vētaṉai*, *kuṟippu*, *pāvaṉai*, and *viññāṇam*. In the next verse the word *kantam* means smell, fragrance or odor.

uṟṟiṭum vaḻakku iraṇṭum oṉṟumuṉ ṟāki āṟām.

[Aruṇanti's extensive analysis of the Sautrāntika principles demonstrates that he has a deep understanding of the doctrines of the school. In this verse, he further expounds on the two types of salvation and the conventions used by the school].

TRANSLATION:

Salvation of faults [is attained] (*kuṟṟavīṭu*) when qualities such as passion (*arākam āti kuṇaṅkaḷ*) are controlled (*kuṟaitta lākum*). The other salvation [is attained] (*maṟṟavīṭu*) when the five [*skanda*s] (*aintaiyum*) such as form (*uruvam āti*) are destroyed (*māyttāl ākum*). The two beliefs (*vaḻakku iraṇṭum*) [are further divided] into three categories each (*eṉṟu mūṉṟāy*) such as aggregation (*tokai*), continuation (*tōṭarcci*), and destruction (*mikutturai*), making a total of six (*oṉṟu muṉṟāki āṟām*).[393]

VERSE 70

oruvaṉeṉṟu ōtap paṭṭāṉ uruvāti aintum kūṭi
varupavaṉ eṉṟu uraittal tokaiyuṇmai vaḻakka tākum
uruvam aṅku āti yāya aintaiyum oruvaṉ iṉṟu
taruvatu tokaiyiṉ iṉmai vaḻakkatām cāṟṟum kālē.

[The Sautrāntika provides examples of true belief (*tokai uṇmai vaḻakku*) in the aggregate of five *skanda*s and a false belief (*tokai iṉmai vaḻakku*) in suggesting a human form without the aggregate].

TRANSLATION:

To declare that (*eṉṟu uraittal*) the aggregate of five [*skanda*s] (*aintum kūṭi*

[393] The six conventions/beliefs are 1) *tokai uṇmai vaḻakku*, 2) *tokai iṉmai vaḻakku*, 3) *toṭarcci uṇmai vaḻakku*, 4) *toṭarcci iṉmai vaḻakku*, 5) *mikatturai uṇmai vaḻakku*, and 6) *mikattṟai iṉmai vaḻakku*. See MUTTAPPAN 2003:49.

varupavaṉ) results in a form (*oruvaṉ eṉṟu uruvāti*) called a man [human being] (*ōtap paṭṭāṉ*) is the right tradition of aggregation (*tokaiy uṇmai vaḻakka tākum*). The false tradition of aggregation (*tokaiyiṉ iṉmai vaḻakkatām*) is to proclaim (*cāṟṟum kālē*) that the form (*uruvam*) is an object different (*oruvaṉ iṉṟu taruvatu*) from the aggregate of five [*skanda*s] (*aintaiyum*).

VERSE 71

kāraṇa kāri yattiṉ toṭarcciyāyk kālam mūṉṟiṉ
cōrvaṟat tōṉṟum keṭṭu vaḻiyeṉkai toṭarcci uṇmai
ōrtariṉ oruvaṉē ek kālattum uḷḷāṉ eṉṟu
tērvatu toṭarcci iṉmai vaḻakkatām ceppum kālē.

[This verse clarifies that right belief of succession is to hold that events succeed one another as cause and effect without any reference to time sequence such as past, present, and future. Furthermore, there is no continuity in succession. It will be a wrong belief of succession to hold that one soul remains unchanged although undergoing continued succession of cause and effect].

TRANSLATION:

To maintain that events follow one another (*toṭarcciyāy*) as a result of cause and effect (*kāraṇa kāriyattiṉ*) without reference (*cōrvaṟat tōṉṟum*) to the three periods of time [past, present, and future] (*kālam mūṉṟiṉ*) is the right belief about succession (*uṇmai toṭarcci*). A suggestion that (*tērvatu*) a creator (*ōrtariṉ*) exists eternally [in continued succession of cause and effect] (*oruvaṉē ekkālattum uḷḷāṉ*), if declared (*ceppum kālē*), is a wrong belief of succession (*toṭarcci iṉmai vaḻakkatām*).

VERSE 72

tōṟṟiya poruḷkaḷ ellām nācamām eṉṟu collum
māṟṟammuṉ uraittal maṟṟai mikutturai vaḻakkiṉ uṇmai
pōṟṟiya poruḷkaṇ kaṭkup pōṉatu pōlmu tirntu

vēr̲rumaip pṭṭatu eṉ̲kai mikutturai ilva l̲akkē.

[The right belief is to hold that all things that appear will be destroyed. It is a wrong belief to hold that things exist and do not die because of cause and effect].

TRANSLATION:

To maintain (*eṉ̲ru collum mār̲ram*) that all things that appear (*tōr̲riya poruḷkaḷ ellām*) will be destroyed (*nācamām*) is the right tradition [belief] (*mikutturai val̲akkiṉ̲ uṇmai*). To maintain that things are not destroyed but continue to exist and appear because of (*pōr̲riya poruḷkaṉ̲ kaṭkup pōṉ̲atu pōl*) maturation (*mutirntu*) and differentiation (*vēr̲rumaip pṭṭatu eṉ̲kai*) is false tradition [belief] (*mikutturai il val̲akkē*).

VERSE 73

uḷval̲akku ilva l̲akkuuḷ ḷatucārnta uḷva l̲akkōṭu
uḷḷatu cārnta iṉ̲mai val̲akkuṭaṉ̲ iṉ̲mai cārnta
uḷval̲akku iṉ̲mai cārnta ilval̲akku eṉ̲r̲ōr ār̲ām
uḷval̲akku uḷatuṇṭu eṉ̲kai muyar̲kōṭuiṉ̲r̲u ilva l̲akkē.

[The two kinds of belief, right and wrong, are further subdivided into as right-right-belief, right-false-belief, false-right-belief, and false-false-belief].

TRANSLATION:

[The two types of beliefs are:] right beliefs (*uḷ val̲akku*) and false beliefs (*il val̲akku*). [Each of them further split into] right-right-belief (uḷḷatu *cārnta uḷ val̲akkōṭu*), right-false-belief (*uḷḷatu cārnta iṉ̲mai val̲akku*), false-right-belief (*iṉ̲mai cārnta uḷ val̲akku*), and false-false belief (*iṉ̲mai cārnta il val̲akku*). [Thus, we arrive at] six types (*eṉ̲r̲ōr ār̲ām*). Right belief (*uḷval̲akku*) is to state (*eṉ̲kai*) that an existing thing (*uḷatu*) exists (*uṇṭu*). False belief (*il val̲akkē*) is to say that a hare has horns (*muyar̲kōṭu iṉ̲r̲u*).

VERSE 74

uṇarvucārntu uṇarvu utikkai uḷḷatu cārnta uṇmai
uṇarvupiṉ iṉṟām eṉkai uḷḷatu cārnta iṉmai
uṇarvumuṉpu iṉṟit tōṉṟal illatu cārnta uṇmai
uṇariṉil latucār iṉmai uḷḷaṅkai urōma nāṇē.

[The Sautrāntika describes the four kinds of truths/beliefs, and up to this verse, he has discussed the tenets of his school. Starting with the next verse, he will focus on other schools].

TRANSLATION:

[To suggest that] sense perception (*uṇarvu*) is born (*utikkai*) from mere contact (*uṇarvu cārntu*)[394] is the right-right-truth (*uḷḷatu cārnta uṇmai*). To maintain that (*eṉkai*) [if consciousness/knowledge disappears], another cannot appear (*uṇarvupiṉ iṉṟām*) in its place is right-false-truth (*uḷḷatu cārnta iṉmai*). [To say that] there was no consciousness before what arises (*uṇarvumuṉpu iṉṟit tōṉṟal*) is a false-right-truth (*illatu cārnta uṇmai*). To hold that a rope (*nāṇē*) is made out of the hair growing in one's palm (*uḷḷaṅkai urōma*) is a false-false-belief (*uṇariṉillatu iṉmai*).

VERSE 75

coṉṉanāl vakaiyum aṉṟic colliṭum poruḷkaḷ ellām
eṉṉaiyō aṟiki lōmpittu ēṟiyō vāṉam āṉmā
maṉṉukā laṅkaḷ tikku maṉamoṭu vākku iṟantiṭṭu
uṉṉumōr iṟaiyum uṇṭeṉṟu uraippatu nittam aṉṟē.

[The Sautrāntika begins arguing that besides the four truths discussed in the previous verse, people mistakenly recognize space, soul, the cardinal directions, and the concept of time. He quickly attributes insanity to their views].

---

[394] One of the meanings of the Tamil word "*cārntal*" is "to be near to" or "to depend upon" *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "cārntal" (p. 1382)*. The poet uses the word to mean "by contact".

TRANSLATION:

Other than the four kinds already discussed (*coṉṉa nāl vakaiyum aṉṟi*)[395] and their elaboration (*colliṭum poruḷkaḷ ellām*), [the Sautrāntikas] recognize space (*vāṉam*), soul (*āṉmā*), periods of time (*maṉṉu kālaṅkaḷ*), and cardinal directions (*tikku*). They claim that (*eṉṟu uraippatu*) a god who is beyond intellectual comprehension (*maṉamoṭu vākku iṟantiṭṭu*) exists (*ōr iṟaiyum uṇṭu eṉṟu*) and yet is impermanent (*nittam aṉṟē*). Are they not delirious or insane (*pittu ēṟiyō*)? We do not understand these [claims] (*eṉṉaiyō aṟikilōm*).

VERSE 76

īṅku vāṉ ceyaṟku vārātu iyampiya poruḷkaḷ ellām
tāṅkuvāṉ uḷatē eṉṉil tarittiṭātu aruvam ātal
ōṅkuvāṉ ōcaikku āti eṉilatu aṅku uruviṉ kūṭṭam
nīṅkuvāṉ iṉṟi eṅkum niṉṟatēl eṅkum iṉṟē.

[Sky (space) cannot be considered an element because it has no form. The claim that space pervades everything is contradicted].

TRANSLATION:

In this manner [here] (*īṅku*), the sky [space] (*vāṉ*) cannot produce anything (*ceyaṟku vārātu*). If you say it supports (*tāṅkuvāṉ uḷatē eṉṉil*) other products of the four elements (*iyampiya poruḷkaḷ ellām*),[396] [it cannot be so because] space has no form [to be supported] (*tarittiṭātu aruvam ātal*). Some may say (*ōṅkuvāṉ*) that space is the source of sound (*ōcaikku āti eṉil*), [but it cannot be so, because sound is a product of] bodies with form (*uruviṉ kūṭṭam*). Some may say space is everywhere (*eṅkum niṉṟatēl*), and it can be said that it is nowhere (*nīṅkuvāṉ iṉṟi*

[395] The four kinds referred to are: form (*uru*), formlessness (*aruvam*), release (*vīṭu*), and tradition (*vaḻakku*) mentioned in verse 66.
[396] The four elements are earth (*maṉ*), water (*puṉal*), fire (*aṉal*), and air (*kāl*).

eṅkum iṉṟē).

VERSE 77

pōtamuṇṭu uyirkaṭku eṉṉil vāyilaim pulaṉum nūlum
āytaliṉ toṭṭut tīṭṭuk kalappiṉil aṟiyum eṉṉil
ētamuṇṭu iṟaviṟ paccai civappuṭaṉ ēynta pōtu
kētamniṉṟu eṉṉō eṉṉum aiyamuṉ kiṭatta lālē.

[Some questions are raised. If, as the other schools claim, that souls have inherent knowledge, why should knowledge be acquired by the senses and from the treatises? Secondly, why cannot the soul with its supposedly inherent knowledge, cannot distinguish a red cloth from a blue cloth when they are in a dark room?].

TRANSLATION:

If souls [humans] have knowledge (*uyirkaṭku pōtamuṇṭu eṉṉil*), [why should they] seek knowledge (*āytaliṉ*) through the sense organs (*vāyil*), five senses (*aim pulaṉum*) and books [scriptures] (*nūlum*)? If you suggest that knowledge is acquired (*aṟiyum eṉṉil*) by uniting with [the senses] (*kalappiṉil*), and by contact (*toṭṭut*) and by sharpening [the knowledge with the books] (*tīṭṭuk*), [your argument is] defective (*ētamuṇṭu*) because one will be in distress (*kētamniṉṟu*), if one is in doubt about [cannot differentiate between] (*aiyamuṉ kiṭattalālē*) something red or green (*paccai civappuṭaṉ ēynta pōtu*)) in the dark (*iṟaviṟ*), and is confused (*eṉṉō eṉṉum*).

VERSE 78

aṟintiṭā vāyil iṉṟēl aṟiviṉṟām aintum paṟṟi
aṟintiṭum aṟivuuṇṭu eṉṉil aintiṉum aṟivuoṉ ṟāka
aṟintiṭa vēṇṭum cārpiṉ aṟintiṭum eṉṉil uṉṉai
aṟintilōm puttaṉ eṉṟiṅku aḷakitu coṉṉa vāṟē.

[This verse reiterates the non-existence of the soul; if the soul gathers knowledge

from the senses, then it has no intrinsic knowledge, and hence does not exist. “If the soul’s has no knowledge on its own accord, how could we hold that you have any knowledge”? The Sautrāntika states that such views such as the souls getting their intelligence from the senses are, in fact, in agreement with the Buddhist school].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that [the soul] will not be knowledgeable (*aṟintiṭā*) without the senses (*vāyil iṉṟēl*), and the soul gets intelligence (*aṟintiṭum aṟivuuṇṭu eṉṉil*) because of its union with five senses (*aṟiviṉṟām aintum paṟṟi*), then the intelligence (*aṟivu*) through the five senses (*aintiṉum*) must be available to one [every] sense (*oṉṟāka aṟintiṭa vēṇṭum*). [If you say that the soul gets] its intelligence because of its dependence on the senses (*cārpiṉ aṟintiṭum eṉṉil*), then we failed to recognize (*aṟintilōm*) you (*uṉṉai*) as a Buddhist (*puttaṉ eṉṟiṅku*). What you state is really beautiful (*aḻakitu coṉṉa vāṟē*)![397]

VERSE 79

ñāṉañē yaṅkaḷ aṉṟi ñātiru eṉṟu colla
āṉatiṅku aṟivō aṉṟō aṉṟeṉil avaṉi pōlum
tāṉatiṅku aṟivē eṉṉil camaittiṭu naṉpa ruppup
pōṉakam taṉakkut tāṉē kaṟiyeṉap pukaṉṟa tāmē.

[The Sautrāntika continues the theme on the soul. He points out the untenability of the “soul” theory and questions if the soul has no knowledge, why should it be given an identity?].

TRANSLATION:

If you suggest that (*eṉṟu colla*) [there is] a knower (*ñātiru*), besides knowledge (*ñāṉa*) and the object of knowledge (*ñēyaṅkaḷ*), does the knower have

[397] The sarcasm is obvious.

intelligence or not (*āṉatiṅku aṟivō aṉṟō*)? If [the knower is] not intelligent (*aṉṟeṉil*), it is similar to earth [without any knowledge] (*avaṉi pōlum*). If you say it is intelligent (*aṟivē eṉṉil*), then it is akin to praising (*pukaṉṟa tāmē*), [just as] the lentil is the curry [side dish] (*taṉakkut tāṉē kaṟiyeṉap*) in a cooked (*camaittiṭu*) meal of lentil rice (*paruppup pōṉakam*).[398]

VERSE 80

uyiriṉai aruva teṉṉil uruvuṭaṉ uṟṟu nillātu
uyiriṉai uruva teṉṉil uṭaliṉil uṭal aṭaṅkātu
uyiriṉai aṇuva teṉṉil uṭalpala tuvāra mōṭum
uyiriṉai nittam eṉṉil uṇarvuuta yāntam iṉṟē.

[If the soul has a form, it cannot be contained in another body; if it is formless, it cannot be associated with another body with a form. If it were of atomic nature, it would slip out of the many openings of the body. If it is claimed to be eternal, then it cannot have either a birth or a death].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that the soul has no form (*uyiriṉai aruva teṉṉil*), then it cannot combine with the body [which has a form] (*uruvuṭaṉ uṟṟu nillātu*). If you say that the soul has a form (*uyiriṉai uruva teṉṉil*), one form cannot be contained in another form (*uṭaliṉil uṭal aṭaṅkātu*). If you say that the soul is similar to an atom (*uyiriṉai aṇu vateṉṉil*), the soul will escape (*ōṭum*) as the body has several holes (*uṭal pala tuvāram*). If you say that the soul is permanent (*uyiriṉai nittam eṉṉil*), then consciousness (*uṇarvu*) has neither a beginning nor an end (*utayāntam iṉṟē*).[399]

---

[398] The reference to "lentil rice" is to demonstrate that just as lentil is part of the dish (lentil rice) and it cannot be called a side dish, so if knowledge is intrinsic to the souls, then knowledge cannot be separate from the soul.

[399] It must be pointed out again that the poet uses the three words *putti* (*buddhi* in Sanskrit), *āṉmā* (*ātmā* in Sanskrit), and *uṇarvu* (*jñāna* in Sanskrit) interchangeably. Depending on the context they could mean intellect, knowledge, the soul, and/or consciousness.

VERSE 81

eṅkumāy niṉṟatu āṉmā eṉṟiṭiṉ eṅkum iṉṟām
taṅkiṭu niṟaivu tattam carīraṅkaḷ tōṟum eṉṉiṉ
maṅkiṭum uṭalat tōṭē vaṭiviṉil ōri ṭattē
aṅkatu niṉṟatu eṉṉil aṭimuṭi aṟiviṉṟu āmē.

[This verse repeats the suggestion of "no soul" from another angle. If you say that the soul pervades everywhere, it cannot be true as there is no evidence of its presence everywhere. If it is part of the body, then it should have its demise with the body. If it is confined to a particular place in the body, the other parts of the body will lack consciousness].

TRANSLATION:

If it is said that (*eṉṟiṭiṉ*) the soul (*āṉmā*) is all-pervading (*eṅkumāy niṉṟatu*), it cannot be everywhere (*eṅkum iṉṟām*).[400] If it is said that souls appear in (*tōṟum eṉṉiṉ*) and fully permeate (*taṅkiṭu niṟaivu*) individual bodies (*tattam carīraṅkaḷ*), then they should deteriorate (*maṅkiṭum*) along with the bodies [as the bodies deteriorate] (*uṭalat tōṭē*). If it is said (*eṉṉil*) that [the soul] stays (*aṅkatu niṉṟatu*) in one place (*ōr iṭattē*) in the body (*vaṭiviṉil*), then it cannot have consciousness (*aṟiviṉṟu āmē*) of [all parts] from head-to-foot (*aṭimuṭi*).

VERSE 82

cāṟṟiya kālam iṅkut taṅkiya vāṟitu eṉṉai
tōṟṟuvittu aḷittup pōkkum toḻilivai kālam eṉṉiṉ
pōṟṟiya poruḷil pukkup piṇaṅkiṭum poruṭpiṉ iṉṟām
tēṟṟiya ilva ḻakkut tiraviyattu iyalpiṉ āmē.

[To suggest that there are three kinds of time and not three kinds of objects is

[400] The suggestion here is that there are several kinds of bodies and our consciousness does not pervade everywhere.

erroneous].

TRANSLATION:

How does your "Time" (*kālam*) stated before (*cārriya*) operate [how is it established] (*taṅkiya vāritu eṉṉai*)? If it is said that the acts of (*tolilivai eṉṉiṉ*) creation (*tōrruvittu*), maintenance (*aḷittup*), and destruction (*pōkkum*) belong to "Time" (*kālam*), then it will be confused (*piṇaṅkiṭum*)[401] with objects under its protection (*pōrriya poruḷil*). When objects [disappear] (*poruṭpiṉ*), "Time" will cease to exist (*iṉṟām*). [Thus,] the stated [argument] (*tērriya*) about the nature (*iyalpu*) of "Time" (*tiraviyattu*) [402] is a false belief (*il valakku*).

VERSE 83

eṉakkunī kiḻakku iruntāy ākiṉmēṟku eṉṟāy eṉpāl
eṉakkumēṟku iruntāṉ eṉpāl kiḻakkeṉa iyampum tikkut
taṉakkunām koḷvatu eppāl cārriṭāy ilva ḻakkut
taṉakkuḷa tākum uṇmai tāṉila tākum aṉṟē.

[The Sautrāntika claims that the concept of cardinal directions is erroneous].

TRANSLATION:

If you are [standing] east (*kiḻakku iruntāy*) of me (*eṉakkunī*), you will say (*eṉṟāy*) that I am west (*mēṟku eṉpāl*) of you. One who is standing west of me (*eṉakku mēṟku iruntāṉ*) will say (*iyampum*) that I am east of him (*eṉpāl kiḻakkeṉa*). Tell me (*cārriṭāy*) how can we (*nām taṉakku*) establish (*koḷvatu eppāl*) [the concept of cardinal] directions (*tikku*)? There is no truth (*uṇmai ilatākum aṉṟē*) in your false belief (*ilva ḻakku*). [The concept of cardinal directions is untenable].

VERSE 84

---

[401] The reference here is about the substratum of three periods of time—past, present, and future.

[402] The word "*tiraviyam*" in this context means "Time." *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "tiraviyam" (p. 1885)*.

ulakiṉaip paṭaittāṉ eṉṟāy oruvaṉiṅku uḷḷatu āyiṉ
ulakiṉaip paṭaikka vēṇṭā illaiyēl paṭaikka oṇṇātu
ulakiṉakku upātā ṉamtāṉ uḷḷatāyk kāri yattām
ulakiṉaip paṭaikkil aṅkum uḷatilatu āvatu uṇṭō.

[If the earth existed forever, it needs no creator; if it did not exist, it could not be created (rather a dubious claim). If the creation is attributed to cause and effect, then it must both exist and not exist].[403]

TRANSLATION:

You stated (*eṉṟāy*) that the world (*ulakiṉai*) was created (*paṭaittāṉ*) by one (*oruvaṉ*). If the world (*ulakiṉ*) existed before (*iṅku uḷḷatu āyiṉ*), [then] there was no need to create it (*paṭaikka vēṇṭā*). If [the world] did not exist (*illaiyēl*), creation (*paṭaikka*) is not feasible (*oṇṇātu*). If creation of the world (*ulakiṉaip paṭaikkil*) means creating the effect (*kāriyattām*) from its material cause (*upātā ṉamtāṉ*), is it possible (*āvatu uṇṭō*) for the world to exist and not exist (*uḷatilatu*)?

VERSE 85

uḷḷatu kaṭāti pōla utippittāṉ eṉṟu uraikkiṉ
meḷḷavē eṅku niṉṟu vititttaṉaṉ ulakiṉ mītu
vaḷḷaltāṉ niṉṟāṉ eṉṉil vantatām ulakam muṉṉē
taḷḷiṭātu eṅkum niṟkil eṅkumuṉ tanta tāmē.

[Where was god standing when he created the earth? If you claim that he stood on the world, you suggest that it was there before creation. If he was everywhere, that "everywhere" must have existed before god created it!].

TRANSLATION:

If you say (*eṉṟu uraikkiṉ*) that he created (*uḷḷatu utippittāṉ*) the world [akin to a

[403] The logic is unclear and the argument appears to be weak and doubtful.

potter creating] clay pots (*kaṭāti pōla*), where did he stand (*eṅku niṉ̲ru*) when he slowly (*meḷḷavē*) created (*vititta̲na̲n*) the world? If god (*vaḷḷaltā̲n*)[404] stood on earth (*ulaki̲n mītuni̲n̲rā̲n e̲n̲̲nil*) [when he created it, then it means that] the world (*ulakam*) was there before [he created it] (*vantatām muṉṉē*). If he was everywhere (*eṅkum ni̲rkil*) without exception (*taḷḷiṭātu*), that "everywhere" (*eṅkum*) should have been there before [him] (*muṉ tanta tāmē*).

VERSE 86

illatu karuṇai yālē iya̲rrivaṉ i̲raivaṉ e̲n̲̲nil
kollari u̲luvai nākam kū̲rramum koṇṭu tō̲rra
vallavaṉ karuṇai e̲n̲̲nō valiyiṉāl vēṇṭi̲rru ellām
palkavē paṭaittā̲n āyi̲n pittaraip paṇinti ṭāyē.

[This verse denies the role of a "creator." "If your god is a compassionate and a kind creator, how do you explain the creation of evil? If you call it all a play (*līlā*), then you are worshipping an insane god"].

TRANSLATION:

If you state (*e̲n̲̲nil*) that god (*i̲raivaṉ*) created [this world] (*iya̲rrivaṉ*) from nothing (*illatu*) and only out of his compassion (*karuṇai yālē*), then where was his (*vallava̲n*)[405] compassion (*karuṇai e̲n̲̲nō*) when he created (*koṇṭu tō̲rra*) lethal (*kol*) [animals such as] lions (*ari*), tigers (*u̲luvai*), snakes (*nākam*), and [also] Yama (*kū̲rramum*)[406]? If he created all (*ellām*) to multiply (*palkavē paṭaittā̲n*), because of his strength (*valiyiṉāl*) and desire (*vēṇṭi̲rru*), you might as well worship a demented person (*pittaraip paṇinti ṭāyē*).

---

[404] The Tamil word "*vaḷḷal*" refers to a charitable donor or compassion. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "vaḷḷal" (p. 3551)*. In this context it refers to the creator.

[405] The Tamil word "*vallava̲n*" has several meanings such as "a strong man", "a capable man" and "a shepherd." *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "vallava̲n" (p. 3528)*. The word used here in the nominative case (instead of possessive case) refers to god.

[406] Kū̲rra̲n is an epithet of Yama, the god of death. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "Kū̲rra̲n " (p. 1080)*.

VERSE 87

peṟuvatiṅku eṉ paṭaittup perṟatu viḷaiyāṭṭu eṉṉil
ciṟumaḻavu iṟaiya tākum ceytiṭum kaṉmattu eṉṉiṉ
uṟupeṟum kaṉmam ceyvōr muṉpuḷar āvar uṇmai
aṟivuṟiṉ ñāla mellām anātiyeṉṟu aṟintiṭāyē.

["If the world was created for playful reasons, then your god is similar to a child. If the world was created due to karma of the souls, then these souls must have existed before creation. If you do due diligence, you will realize that there is no god and the world is eternal"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say creation (*paṭaittu*) brought forth (*peṟuva*) here [in this world] (*iṅku*) is the result of (*perṟatu*) [god's] play (*viḷaiyāṭṭu eṉṉil*), then a child (*ciṟumaḻavu*) can be a god (*iṟaiya tākum*). If it is said that it [the creation] is due to karma (*kaṉmattu eṉṉiṉ*) committed (*ceytiṭum*), then those (*uṟupeṟum*) who perpetrated these [acts of] karma (*kaṉmam ceyvōr*) would have existed before (*muṉpuḷar āvar*). If you truthfully examine (*uṇmaiaṟivuṟiṉ*) everything (*ellām*), you will learn (*aṟintiṭāyē*) that the world (*ñālam*) is eternal (*anātiyeṉṟu*).

VERSE 88

uruvoṭu niṉṟāṉ eṉṉil uruvammuṉ paṭaittār vēṇṭum
uruavaṉ iccai eṉṉil ulakelām iccai yākum
uruvula kattu ḷōrkaṭku uṟuvatu kaṉmāl eṉṉil
uruvuṭai yōrkaṭku ellām uṟṟatu kaṉmat tāmē.

["If you claim that god has a form, then who created this form? If his form was created just by his desire, then anyone desiring a form can create it. If his form was created by karma, then karma must have existed before god"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say (*eṉṉil*) that [god] has a form (*uruvoṭu niṉṟāṉ*), then there must be (*vēṇṭum*) a creator (*paṭaittār*) of this form (*uruvammuṉ*). If you say that (*eṉṉil*) his form (*avaṉ uru*) is created by his [own] desire (*iccai*), the whole world (*ulaku elām*) could have come about (*yākum*) by desire (*iccai*). [Furthermore,] if the people of the world (*uruvula kattuḷōrkaṭku*) get their form (*uṟuvatu*) due to karma (*kaṉmāl eṉṉil*), [then it could be said that], in fact (*uṟṟatu*), that anyone who has a form (*uruvuṭai yōrkaṭku ellām*) [it] is due to his karma (*kaṉmat tāmē*).[407]

VERSE 89

aruveṉil pavattiṉ niṉṟum eṭuttiṭāṉ ākā yampōl
maruviṉaṉ niḻalpōl eṉṉiṉ maruviṉōrkku ākum māṭci
perukiya aṟivuṇṭu eṉṟu pēciṭiṉ nēcattōṭum
karutiṭa uruvam vēṇṭum illaiyēl karuta liṉṟē.

["On the other hand, if you say that god has no form, then he has no knowledge as he lacks sense perceptions. If he has no form, he cannot be the recipient of the affection of those who revere him"].

TRANSLATION:

[If you say that he is] similar to the sky [space] (*ākāyam pōl*) without any form (*aruveṉil*), then he cannot save [people] (*eṭuttiṭāṉ*) from birth [earthly life] (*pavattiṉ niṉṟum*). If it is said that he resembles the shadow of a tree [similar to the shade provided by the tree] (*maruviṉaṉ niḻalpōl eṉṉiṉ*), then glory to those (*ākum māṭci*) who sought the shade (*maruviṉōrkku*). If he is considered (*eṉṟu pēciṭiṉ*) omniscient (*perukiya aṟivuṇṭu*), then he must have a form (*uruvam vēṇṭum*) to be regarded (*karutiṭa*) with affection (*nēcattōṭum*). If not [if there is no such form] (*illaiyēl*), then there is no knowledge (*karutal iṉṟē*).[408]

---

[407] The suggestion here is that if god has a form, then it is because of his karma.

[408] The Tamil word "*karutal*" means "inference" *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "karutal" (p. 757)*. In the present context, it means "knowledge".

VERSE 90

eṅkaḷṉūl anāti yāka iṟaivaṉ uṇṭu eṉṉum eṉṉiṉ
uṅkaḷnūl uraippār iṉṟi ōtuvatu aḻaki tākum
aṅkavaṉ taṉṉai nūlkoṇṭu aṟintaṇam avaṉaik koṇṭē
iṅkunūl aṟintōm eṉṉiṉ īṯuōr āc cariya māmē.

[The Sautrāntika points out the circular logic of the theists. "You say that your Āgamas do not have any author, and were given to by god; it is beautiful (read ridiculous) for you to say that you knew god by the Āgamas and knew the Āgamas with the help of god"].

TRANSLATION:

The Āgamas (*eṅkaḷ ṉūl*), which are eternal (*anāti*), declare the existence of god (*iṟaivaṉ uṇṭu eṉṉum eṉṉiṉ*). It is beautiful [ridiculous] (*aḻaki tākum*) to state that the treatises (*uṅkaḷ nūl*) came into existence (*ōtuvatu*) without an author (*uraippār iṉṟi*). If the theists (*aṅkavaṉ*) [hold that] the god is known through the treatises (*taṉṉai nūlkoṇṭu aṟintaṇam*) and they gained knowledge (*aṟintōm*) from the treatises (*iṅkunūl eṉṉiṉ*) composed by god (*avaṉaik koṇṭē*), it is perplexing (*īṯuōr āccariya māmē*).

VERSE 91

uṟṟeḻu maraṅkaḷ āti uyiriṉṟip pūta rūpam
paṟṟiip pāriṉ mīṯu pāṅkiṉāl palavu mākip
puṟṟoṭu mayirkompu āti pōlavē tōṉṟi māyum
maṟṟuḷa yōṉi kaṭkup payaṉeṉa vaḻaṅkum aṉṟē.

["The vegetable kingdom and the animal kingdom flourish on this earth for the benefit of humanity." The suggestion here is that eating meat is not sinful].

TRANSLATION:

Vegetation such as trees (*maraṅkaḷ āti*) grow (*uṟṟeḻu*) on this earth (*pāriṉ mīṯu*)

without any consciousness (*uyiriṉṟi*). By nature (*pāṅkiṉāl*), they take forms from the elements (*pūta rūpam paṟṟii*), and they multiply (*palavum āki*). They appear and disappear [grow and die] (*tōṉṟi māyum*) similar to (*pōlavē*) anthills (*puṟṟoṭu*), hair, and horns (*mayirkompu āti*). They exist only (*vaḻaṅkum aṉṟē*) for the benefit (*payaṉeṉa*) of other (*maṟṟuḻa*) lives (*yōṉi kaṭku*).

VERSE 92

koṉṟiṭal ākātu eṉṟum koṉṟavai koṇṭu nāḷum
tiṉṟiṭal ākum maṇṇōṭu ottiṭum cetta vellām
oṉṟiya vācam ūṭṭi uṇṇunīr vaitta varkkō
ceṉṟuniṉṟu uṇṭa varkkō puṇṇiyam ceppi ṭāyē.

[Continuing on the same theme, the Sautrāntika states that although killing is not permitted; eating the flesh of an animal slaughtered by someone else is not sinful. Dead animals are as inert as the earth. The one committing the sin of killing will be punished, but not the one who enjoys the result of the act, just as the one who dispenses free water to thirsty travelers will gain the merit but not those thirsty travelers who enjoy the largesse].

TRANSLATION:

Killing (*koṉṟiṭal*) is not allowed (*ākātu eṉṟum*) but eating daily (*nāḷum tiṉṟiṭal*) what has been killed (*koṉṟavai koṇṭu*) is allowed (*ākum*), because what is dead (*cetta vellām*) is [insentient] earth (*maṇṇōṭu ottiṭum*). Tell me (*ceppi ṭāyē*) who gets the merit (*puṇṇiyam*)! [Is that] the one (*oṉṟiya*) who arranged [a water dispensing stall and provided] (*vaitta varkkō*) fragrant (*vācam ūṭṭi*) potable water (*uṇṇunīr*), or those who went there (*ceṉṟuniṉṟu*) and drank the water (*uṇṭa varkkō*)?

VERSE 93

aḻittiṭum arāka māti akaṟṟinal laṟaṅkaḷ pūrittu
iḻittiṭum pulaṅkaḷ pōkki iṉpoṭu tuṉpam vāṭṭip
paḻittiṭāp paḻutil vāḻkkai eṭṭaiyum pārittu ellām

oḻittiṭu ñāṉa cīlam camātiyiṉ uṟutiyāmē.

["By controlling one's harmful feelings and by nurturing virtuous thoughts and deeds as dictated by the eightfold path one can attain *nirvāṇa*"].

TRANSLATION:

Getting rid of (*akaṟṟi*) destructive feelings (*aḻittiṭum*) such as desire (*arākam*),[409] perfecting (*pūrittu*) virtuous deeds (*nal aṟaṅkaḷ*), controlling (*pōkki*) the senses (*pulaṅkaḷ*) that lead to [temptation] (*iḻittiṭum*), taming (*vāṭṭi*) both pleasure (*iṉpoṭu*) and pain (*tuṉpam*), observing (*pārittu*) the eight-fold path (*eṭṭaiyum*)[410] in a blameless (*paḻittiṭā*) and unflawed (*paḻutil*) life (*vāḻkkai*), destroying all evil (*ellāmoḻittiṭu*), and following the [right] conduct (*cīlam*) with knowledge (*ñāṉa*) will ensure (*uṟutiyāmē*) the final release (*camātiyiṉ*).

VERSE 94

ōṅkiya uruva mōṭum vētaṉai kuṟippi ṉōṭum
tāṅkupā vaṉaiviñ ñāṉam tāmivai aintuṅ kūṭip
pāṅkiṉāl cantā ṉattiṟ keṭuvatu panta tukkam
āṅkavai poṉṟak kēṭāy aḻivatu mutti iṉpam.

[This is the last verse of the Sautrāntika's description of his "The five *skandha*s are the sources of misery of the cycle of birth and death. By destroying them one can attain salvation."]

TRANSLATION:

When the five *skandha*s (*aintu)*—namely, form (*uruvam*), feeling (*vētaṉai*), perception (*kuṟippu*), volition (*pāvaṉai*), and consciousness (*viññāṉam*)—mix and

[409] *Arākam* is the absence of desire and is part of "right view", first step of the Buddhist noble path.

[410] The noble eightfold path consists of: right view, right intention, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration GETHIN 1998:81.

merge (*tāmivai kūṭip pāṅkiṉāl*), they cause continuous (*cantāṉattiṟ keṭuvatu*) bondage (*panta*), and distress (*tukkam*). When these are absolutely destroyed (*poṉṟak kēṭāy aḻivatu*),[411] blissful release [is the result] (*mutti iṉpam*).

4.2B SAUTRĀNTIKA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 95-134)

VERSE 95

aṉaittiṉaiyum uṇarntāṉ em iṟaivaṉ eṉṟu iṅku aṟiyāta puttanī aṟaintāy eṉṟum
aṉaittiṉaiyum aṟintiṭāṉ aḷavi lāmai oṉṟoṉṟō aṉaittiṉaiyum aṟintāṉ eṉṉiṉ
aṉaittiṉaiyum aḷaviṟantatu eṉṉa vēṇṭā aḷavilā ñāṉattāl aṟiyiṉ ñāṉam
aṉaittiṉaiyum aṟiyātu kaṇattil tōṉṟi aḻitalāl aṟintamaiiṉ ṟākum aṉṟē.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin begins to counter the position established by the Sautrāntika. "Your Buddha could not know everything about the universe as it is immeasurable. If you say it is possible due to his limitless wisdom, then based on your concept of "momentariness," it is not possible as his intelligence will undergo changes from moment to moment"].

TRANSLATION:

You Buddhist! (*puttanī*)! Due to ignorance (*aṟiyāta*) you said (*eṉṟu iṅku aṟaintāy*) that your god [the Buddha] (*em iṟaivaṉ*) realized (*uṇarntāṉ*) everything (*aṉaittiṉaiyum*). He could not know (*aṟintiṭāṉ*) everything (*aṉaittiṉaiyum*) [because the universe is] immeasurable (*aḷavi lāmai*). If you say that he realized (*aṟintāṉ eṉṉiṉ*) everything (*aṉaittiṉaiyum*) one by one (*oṉṟoṉṟō*), then the [universe containing] everything (*aṉaittiṉaiyum*) cannot be (*eṉṉa vēṇṭā*) immeasurable (*aḷaviṟantatu*). [If you say that he] gained knowledge (*aṟiyiṉ*) by his limitless

[411] The word "*poṉṟak kēṭāy*" already means "absolue destruction." *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "poṉṟak kēṭāy" (p. 2959)*. It appears that the poet added another word "*aḻivatu*" for emphasis which also means "destruction".

wisdom (*aḷavilā ñāṉattāl*), his wisdom (*ñāṉam*) [will not enable him] to know (*aṟiyātu*) everything (*aṉaittiṉaiyum*). Because everything appears (*tōṉṟi*) and disappears (*aḻitalāl*) in a moment (*kaṇattil*), his knowledge [also] (*aṟintamai*) will be momentary (*iṉṟākum aṉṟē*).

VERSE 96

cilaporuḷai uṇarntavaṟṟiṉ tiṟattē oṭṭic cintippaṉ epporuḷum eṉṉil ceṉṟu
palaporuḷāy oṉṟupala pēta mākip payiṉṟuvarum ātalāl pārkkum āṟeṉ
ulakutaṉil oruporuḷ aṅku uṇarum pōtil uṟṟuṇartal ārāytal teḷital uṇṭāy
nilavumata ṉāluṇarvu paṉmai muṉpiṉ niṉṟiṭātu eṉpaiellām
niṉaippatu eṅkē.

[It is impossible for your Buddha to be omniscient because there are many (millions of) objects in the universe, and to know them, they need to be studied, and reflected upon to understand them. If the theory of momentariness is accepted, how could the knowledge be transmitted from one moment to another when they are transient in nature?].

TRANSLATION:

By contemplating in the same direction (*tiṟattē oṭṭic cintippaṉ*), after knowing a few things (*cilaporuḷai uṇarntavaṟṟiṉ*), you claim that [your Buddha] is aware of everything (*epporuḷum eṉṉil*). However, the objects [of knowledge] are numerous (*palaporuḷāy*), and one object divides itself into many (*oṉṟupala pētamākip payiṉṟuvarum*). Therefore, one object cannot be differentiated from another (*ātalāl pārkkum āṟeṉ*). When observing (*uṇarum pōtil*) an object in the world (*ulakutaṉil oruporuḷ aṅku*), [one should] scrutinize [it] carefully (*uṟṟu*), understand (*uṇartal*), investigate (*ārāytal*), and obtain clarity (*teḷital uṇṭāy*). [This will result in] many stages of understanding (*nilavumata ṉāluṇarvu paṉmai*). [With your theory of momentariness,] how could one understand an object (*niṉaippatu eṅkē*) [with

the knowledge of the object] obtained in two different moments[412] (*muṉpiṉ niṉṟiṭātu eṉpai ellām*)?

VERSE 97

muttinilam kaṇṭu aṟaṅkaḷ moḻintāṉ āyiṉ mutaṉmuḻutum poṉṟippiṉ
moḻinta vaṇṇam
ottiṭumtēṉ neykūṭṭi uṇṭiṟantōṉ oruvaṉ ulakiṉalvantu itutītaṉṟu uraittāl
okkum
cettupiṉ eṉṟuraikkiṉ katiyil cellāt tēraṉurai nīrperukic ceṉṟu āṟākum
attiṉ aḷa vaṟiyātuik karaiyōr tammai akkaraikkē cellaviṭum ācai
yāmē.

[This verse questions the veracity about the Buddha's supposed preaching after he attained salvation].

TRANSLATION:

If you say [that your Buddha] preached (*moḻintāṉ āyiṉ*) righteousness (*aṟaṅkaḷ*) after attaining the final release (*muttinilam kaṇṭu*), it is comparable (*ottiṭum*) to a dead man (*poṉṟippiṉ*) coming back to life (*mutaṉmuḻutum*) and speaking (*moḻinta vaṇṇam*). It is akin to saying (*okkum*) that a person (*oruvaṉ*) who died, after eating (*uṇṭiṟantōṉ*) honey and ghee together (*tēṉ neykūṭṭi*), came back to this world (*ulakiṉalvantu*) and said (*uraittāl*) that it [the combination of honey and ghee] is bad [ruinous] (*itutītaṉṟu*). If you say that (*eṉṟuraikkiṉ*) he died after saying so (*cettupiṉ eṉṟuraikkiṉ*) [i.e., if he preached the knowledge before his death, then you admit that the knowledge was imparted by one who had not realized salvation]. It is similar to saying that [just as] one without knowing the depth of (*attiṉ aḷa vaṟiyātu*) a swift (*katiyil cellāt*) river that has roaring (*tēraṉurai*) and swelling floods (*nīrperukic ceṉṟu āṟākum*) wishes [proclaims that he could] (*ācai*

[412] It is not possible to have full knowledge of an object studied over several moments if the knowledge obtained in one moment is not carried forward to the next moment.

yāmē) reach from this bank (*ik karaiyōr*) to the other bank with his [entire] entourage (*akkaraikkē tammai cellaviṭum*).

VERSE 98

nīrpōla niṉṟuyirkaṭku aḷitti ṭātē neruppāya tuyarppiṟappil nikaḻntu niṉṟu
pārōrkaṭku aḷittapaṭi valaiyil paṭṭa palakalaimāṉ kaṇṭuoru nīḷ kalaipāyntu ōṭi
nērēceṉṟu avvalaikkē nērntāl okkum nīḷpāvak kuḻiyilviḻum nīrmai yākum
ārōiṅku avaṉoppār aṟattai ākkap piṟantu aṟamāk kiṉāṉeṉṉil aṭaṅka āmē.

[The poet ridicules the Buddhist doctrine that the Buddha was born and underwent human travails only to save other human beings. This is similar to a deer getting ensnared in a hunter's trap trying to save others of its kind who are already trapped].

TRANSLATION:

Instead of nourishing [blessing] (*aḷitti ṭātē*) [people's] lives (*uyirkaṭku*) as water does (*nīrpōla niṉṟu*), [your god] undergoes fiery (*neruppāya*) torment of birth (*tuyarp piṟappil*) and appears (*nikaḻntu niṉṟu*) to bless (*aḷittapaṭi*) the worldly people (*pārōrkaṭku*).[413] It is comparable to (*okkum*) a deer (*oru*), which, on seeing many deer (*palakalaimāṉ kaṇṭu*) trapped in a [hunter's] net (*valaiyil paṭṭa*), rushes (*kalaipāyntu ōṭi*) towards them [to save them] (*nērēceṉṟu*) and gets itself trapped (*nērntāl*) in that net (*avvalaikkē*). This nature [path] (*nīrmai*) will only lead to hell [great sin] (*pāvak kuḻiyilviḻum yākum*), and there is no one (*ārōiṅku*) comparable to him [such a god] (*avaṉoppār*). If you say (*eṉṉil*) that he was born (*piṟantu*) to

[413] "*Pārōrkaṭku*" is translated as worldly people (*pirapañcattār*) MUTALIAR 1910:129; PIḶḶAI 1975:46.

establish righteous behavior (*aṟattai ākkap*) and did establish the righteous path (*aṟamāk kiṉāṉ*), then it includes [emulates] everybody (*aṭaṅka āmē*).

VERSE 99

alakiṟanta yōṉikaḷil pukunta ellām aṟattaiaḷit tiṭaeṉṉil avaṟṟiṉ ellām
nilavuvatu kaṉmattāl ākum aṉṟi niṉaintatōr iccaiyiṉāl nikaḻntāṉ ākil
ulakutaṉil uḷḷōrkkum atuvē yākum oruttivayiṟ ṟiṉiliruntu aṅku utaram taḷḷit
talamatilvan tāṉeṉṉil tāyaik koṉṟāṉ tarumattai iṉṟueṉakkuc cāṟṟiṭalē.

[The tone of scorn continues as the Śaiva Siddhāntin states that if the Buddha had several lives, they must have been caused by (bad) karma. If he appeared because he "willed" so, then many a human can emulate that. The Śaiva Siddhāntin taunts the Buddhist further by asking how Buddha could preach compassion when he killed his own mother at birth[414]].

TRANSLATION:

If it is said (*eṉṉil*) that [the Buddha] entered (*pukunta*) endless number of (*alakiṟanta*) wombs (*yōṉikaḷil*) [just] to impart (*aḷittiṭa*) the righteous path [to everybody] (*aṟattai*), then these bodies (*avaṟṟiṉ ellām*) exist [come about] (*nilavuvatu*) due to karma (*kaṉmattāl ākum*). On the other hand (*aṉṟi*), if you say that he carried on (*nikaḻntāṉ ākil*) from his own thoughts (*niṉaintatōr*) of desire (*iccaiyiṉāl*), the same is true (*atuvē yākum*) for everybody (*uḷḷōrkkum*) in this world (*ulakutaṉil*). If you say when he came to the earth (*talamatilvantāṉ eṉṉil*), he came out of a woman's abdomen (*orutti vayiṟṟiṉil iruntu*) by forcing himself out (*utaram taḷḷi*), now (*iṉṟueṉakku*) do not tell me (*cāṟṟiṭalē*) about the righteousness (*tarumattai*) of a man who killed his mother [on his birth] (*tāyaik koṉṟāṉ*)!

---

[414] The Buddha was supposed to have born by splitting his mother's abdomen instead of the normal uterine birth thus preventing defilement.

VERSE 100

ariyiṉoṭu nariuḻuvai ātiyāka āṉapōtu aṟam tirintu kōṟal āti
pariviṉoṭum ceytaṉaṉām illai yākil pacitaṉakkut tiṉpatuavaṉ paḻutai yōtāṉ
karutilavaṉ paratukka tukkaṉ ākil kaṇavaṉiḻan tōrkaṭkum kaṇṇi kuttit tiriyumavar tuyariṉukkum iraṅku vōṉtaṉ ceyal aṟattukku aḻakiyatām ceppum kālē.

[Continuing with the same derision, the Śaiva Siddhāntin asks if the Buddha appeared as carnivorous beasts of prey, how this could portray compassion. "When he appeared as these animals did he eat his game or did he live on straw? How do you explain his compassion when you look at widowed women and the bird-catchers?].

TRANSLATION:

When he appeared (*āṉapōtu*) as a lion (*ari*), or a jackal (*nari*), or a tiger (*uḻuvai*), he must have strayed (*tirintu*) from the righteous path (*aṟam*) and killed them (*kōṟal āti*) with pleasure (*pariviṉoṭum ceytaṉaṉām*). If not, (*illai yākil*), did he eat (*tiṉpatuavaṉ*) straw (*paḻutai yōtāṉ*) when he was hungry (*pacitaṉakku*)? If you suggest (*karutil*) that he [the Buddha] (*avaṉ*) appropriated the distress (*tuyariṉukkum*) of others as his own (*paratukka tukkaṉ ākil*), it can be said that (*ceppum kālē*) his acts of righteousness (*ceyal aṟattukku*) towards those who lost their husbands (*kaṇavaṉ iḻantōrkaṭkum*) and towards hunters (*tiriyumavar*) who kill game with snares (*kaṇṇi kutti*)[415] by taking pity on them (*iraṅku vōṉtaṉ*) is [really] beautiful (*aḻakiyatām*)![416]

VERSE 101

oru poruḻait tēṭi ataṟkku uraiyum tēṭi uraippataṉmuṉ uṇarviṟakkum

---

[415] The Tamil word "*kaṇṇikkuttutal*" means to set a noose for ensnaring game. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "kaṇṇikkuttutal" (p. 695)*. p. 695).

[416] Obvious irony.

uṉakku nūleṉ
maruvivarum cantāṉa vaḻiyil eṉṉiṉ vāyuraitta tēuraittu vaḻaṅkum ākum
perukuvatu keṭṭueṉṉil atupōl āmpiṉ pitturaittatu aṟiyātu pētai collum taruvatu nūlepparicu mutalnaṭuvōṭu iṟuti tāṉviruttam iṉṟiyatu cāṟṟi ṭāyē.

[The Buddhist theory of momentariness is confronted again. "If you perceive an object, and if you want to describe it in words, it cannot be accomplished. Because of its momentary existence, the cognizance of the object would have perished before associating the descriptive words with the object. Based on this, you cannot have any treatise because the meaning of the words in it will not have any continuity to make sense. Every treatise must have a beginning, a middle part, and an end, representing continuity; your treatises do not fulfill this requirement. Hence your claims are delusional and insane"].

TRANSLATION:

How could you have an authoritative treatise (*uṉakku nūleṉ*) when [you claim] that the knowledge of an object [an idea] that you discover (*oru poruḻait tēṭi uṇarvu*) and the words you find to describe that idea (*ataṟkku uraiyum tēṭi*) are lost even before you utter them (*iṟakkum uraippataṉ muṉ*)? If you say that the words appear in succession (*maruvi varum cantāṉa vaḻiyil eṉṉiṉ*), then what has [already] been said (*vāy uraittatē*), [the same] words should [repeatedly] reappear (*uraittu vaḻaṅkum ākum*). [If you say that,] what appeared in the past decays (*perukuvatu keṭṭu eṉṉil*) and what succeeds will grow (*piṉ atupōl*) [is also a wrong premise because of the momentary nature of things]. The ignorant sayings (*aṟiyātu collum*) and stupid teachings of your treatise (*pētai taruvatu nūl*) are ramblings of a demented person (*pittu uraittatu*). In what manner can you explain (*epparicu cāṟṟiṭāyē*) the beginning, the middle, and the end (*mutal, naṭuvōṭu, iṟuti*) [of your treatise] without inconsistencies (*viruttam iṉṟiyatu*)?

VERSE 102

muṉṉākap palaaṟaṅkaḷ pūrittuem iṟaivaṉ muḻutuṇarntuiṅku aruḷiṉāl uyirkaḷ mutti aṭaiyap
piṉṉākap piṭakanūl uraittāṉ eṉṟu pēciṉāy ivaṉmuṉpu pēraṟaṅkaḷ purinūl
coṉṉārār ivaṉaippōl muṉṉoruvaṉ eṉṉil avaṉukkuc coṉṉārār eṉattoṭarcci yāki
aṉṉāypiṉ aṉavattaip paṭumoruvaṉ iṉṟām ārōuṉ pāḻiruppār itaṉai aṟaiyē.

["You claim that your Buddha practiced a virtuous life and realized salvation; out of his compassion for others he wrote the treatises. Who taught him about the virtues and vices? If you say that it was his predecessor, then who taught these values to that predecessor? Who gave these laws in the beginning? Who is the god in your school? Obviously this leads to a meaningless regression with no beginning"].

TRANSLATION:

You said that your god (*em iṟaivaṉ*) after accomplishing many virtuous deeds in the beginning (*pala aṟaṅkaḷ muṉṉākap pūrittu eṉṟu pēciṉāy*), and after realizing everything because of his compassion (*aruḷiṉāl muḻutuṇarntu*) later composed the *Tripiṭaka*[417] (*piṉṉāka piṭakanūl uraittāṉ*) to help all souls on the earth to obtain their final release (*iṅku uyirkaḷ mutti aṭaiya*). Who declared those great virtues (*pēraṟaṅkaḷ*) in a treatise (*ār purinūl coṉṉār*) before him [the Buddha] (*ivaṉmuṉpu*)? If you say someone similar to him [the Buddha] (*ivaṉaippōl eṉṉil*), but before him (*muṉṉoruvaṉ*), then who taught this predecessor (*ār avaṉukku coṉṉār*)? This continuous chain [will prove that] there is no one (*toṭarcci yāki*

[417] *Tripiṭaka* [Sanskrit] "Three baskets" is a collective name for the Buddhist canon. KEOWN 2004:309.

oruvaṉ iṉṟām) behind this fallacious endless regression (*aṉṉāypiṉ aṉavattaip paṭum*). Tell me (*aṟaiyē itaṉai*), who is there (*ārōuṉ iruppār*) in your temple (*pāḷi*)?

VERSE 103

innūlaic coṉṉavaṉ tāṉ iṅkiruntāṉ eṉṉil ivaṉirutti ēttumavaṉ
eṅkiruntāṉ evaṉō
annūlō kuruvanta aṭaivumuṉakku illai aṭaivutariṉ muṭiviṉkaṇ anāti pōtaṉ
coṉṉāṉām avaivētā kamaṅkaḷ ākum curukkiūṇ tavampuriyac colluvatu ellōrum
uṉnūlkaṇ kaḻuvātē utippataṉ muṉ pulālōṭu uṇpāṉōr ūṉpiriyaṉ uraittatuoru nūlē.

["If the Buddha is your god, whom did he worship? Did that god write any treatises? You cannot describe Buddha's lineage. Our god is beginningless and endless, and he gave us the Āgamas and gave us many directives including performance of austerities and dietary laws. Your treatises were composed by an unclean, meat-loving god, who could consume meat even before sunrise"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that the author of this treatise (*innūlai iṅkiruntāṉ coṉṉavaṉ tāṉ eṉṉil*) is [being worshipped], then who is his teacher whom he [the Buddha] worships (*evaṉō ēttum avaṉ ivaṉ*)? Where is he (*eṅku iruntāṉ*)? What is his treatise (*annūlō*)? You do not have [know] (*uṉakku illai*) the lineage of his master (*aṭaivu kuruvanta*). At the end of our lineage [at dissolution] (*aṭaivutariṉ muṭiviṉkaṇ*), our god of beginningless and endless knowledge (*anāti pōtaṉ*) declared [revealed] the Vedāgamas (*coṉṉāṉām avai vētākamaṅkaḷ*). All of them speak of (*ellōrum colluvatu*) concise dietary laws (*curukki ūṇ*) and performing austerities (*tavampuriya*). Your treatise is a treatise composed (*uṉnūl oru nūlē uraittatu*) by a meat-loving (*ūṉpiriyaṉ*) [author] who does not wash his eyes [face] (*kaṇ kaḻuvātē*) and will eat meat (*pulālōṭu uṇpāṉ*) even before sunrise (*utippataṉ muṉ*).

VERSE 104

muṉnūlum vaḻinūlum cārpu nūlum mūṉṟākum ulakattu moḻinta nūlkaḷ
innūliṉ uṉnūliṅku ennūl eṉṉil innūlkāṇ eṉnūleṉṟu iyampa māṭṭāy
uṉnūlum orunūlāy uraippatu eṉṉē ulaṇṭunūl paruttinūl cilampi nūlkaḷ
annūlum allātē poynnūl koṇṭiṅku aṟanōṟṟut tirintavāṟu aḻaki tame.

["We classify our treatises into three groups—primary texts, secondary texts, and commentaries. You do not have any such classification. Then, how could they be bona fide texts? They are not even comparable to the silk from a spider or a cotton thread (it is a play on words—see the footnote). It is laughable that you go around carrying a treatise packed with lies"].

TRANSLATION:

The treatises in this world (*ulakattu moḻinta nūlkaḷ*) are classified as three types (*mūṉṟākum*): primary texts (*muṉnūlum*), secondary texts (*vaḻinūlum*), and an independent commentary (*cārpu nūlum*).[418] If questioned as to which kind of these [three] (*ennūl innūliṉ eṉṉil*) does your treatise belong to (*uṉnūliṅku*), you cannot answer [identify as] (*iyampa māṭṭāy*) that your treatise belongs to such and such kind (*eṉnūl innūlkāṇ*). [Then] why do you declare (*uraippatu eṉṉē*) your treatise as a [bona fide] treatise (*uṉnūlum orunūlāy*)? [Your treatise is not even the silk produced by] an insect larva (*ulaṇṭunūl*), nor cotton thread (*paruttinūl*), nor the silk of a spider (*cilampi nūlkaḷ*).[419] Without being any of these types [treatise/silk] (*annūlum allātē*), it is beautiful [laughable] (*aḻaki tāmē*) that you go

[418] "Authoritative texts are of three kinds: the authority of god (*mutal nūl*), the authority of the sage who provides explanations and exceptions not inconsistent with the original authority (*vaḻi nūl*), the authority of the successor who, following both authorities, gives his own opinion from experience also (*cārpu nūl*)" PILLAI 1913:38.

[419] The Tamil word *nūl* has several meanings. Two important meanings in this context are "a thread" and "a treatise." The poet skillfully uses both meanings to ridicule the Buddhist position.

around carrying (*koṇṭiṅku tirintavāṟu*) a false treatise of lies (*poynnūl*)!

VERSE 105

puttaṉavaṉ poṉṟakkeṭṭup pōṉāṉ eṉṟu pōṟṟuvatu iṅkuārainī
poyttavañcey puttā
cettavarkkuc cilakiriyai ceyya iṅkucceytavarkkum puṇṇiyamām eṉṟu
ceppiṉ
nittamuyir ātalāl palikkum ceyti niṉaintutaru vāṉumuḷaṉ uṉakku
ivvāṟillai
vaittacuṭart tīpamaṟa māyntakkāl ataṟku maruvutiri neykūṭṭu
matikēṭu uṉvaḻakkē.

["Your austerities are deceitful. If one gains merit by worshipping the dead, such beings should be eternal. You do not have a god to recognize. What you claim to be such meritorious acts such as providing offerings to dead ancestors. Your stupid argument is similar to adding a wick and oil to an extinguished lamp"].

TRANSLATION:

O Bauddha! You perform deceitful austerities (*puttā poyttavañcey*). Whom would you worship (*iṅku nī ārai pōṟṟuvatu*) if your Buddha was absolutely ruined (*puttaṉavaṉ poṉṟakkeṭṭu pōṉāṉ*)? If you say that by performing rituals for [honoring] the dead (*cettavarkku cilakiriyai ceyya eṉṟu ceppiṉ*), those who do such acts (*ceytavarkkum*) gain merit in this world (*iṅku puṇṇiyamām*), then all living beings must be eternal (*ātalāl uyir nittam*). You do not acknowledge a god (*uṉakku ivvāṟillai uḷaṉ*) who will bestow his grace on you in recognition (*niṉaintu taruvāṉum*) for all your offerings to your ancestors (*palikkum ceyti*). Your stupid argument (*matikēṭu uṉvaḻakkē*) is similar to adding a wick and ghee [oil] (*maruvu tiri ney kūṭṭu*) to a lamp (*tīpam ataṟku*) where the flame is extinguished (*cuṭar aṟa māyntakkāl*).

VERSE 106

nūluraittāṉ oruvaṉuḷaṉ eṉṟu aṉumā ṉattāl nūlkoṇṭuiṅku aṟintāṟpōl nūlānūliṉ
pāluraitta poruḷkaḷellam aṉumāṉam eṉṉil paralōka pātāḷa lōkaṅkaḷ orucol
lāluraitta nūliṉṟi aṟaiyāy iṉṟēl avaiyaṟinta paṭiyeṉuṉatu aṉumāṉam aṉṟē
mēluraikkum piramāṇam uṉakkillai kāṭci aṉumāṉam viṭṭaporuḷ viḷakkuvatu ākamamē.

[The importance of "testimony" as a valid means of knowledge is stressed. "You say that by gaining the knowledge about a book by inference, one could infer the nature of the author. One cannot understand the nature of heaven and hell unless the knowledge is gleaned from a treatise. (Who is the author of such a treatise?) Such knowledge cannot be inferred. Only treatises such as the Āgamas can offer us such knowledge. Your treatises composed by the Buddha do not accept "testimony," but only perception and inference as valid means of knowledge"].

TRANSLATION:

Just as we learn that the innards of a book (*iṅku aṟintāṟpōl nūlkoṇṭu*) would allow us to infer the existence of its author (*aṉumāṉattāl oruvaṉuḷaṉ nūluraittāṉ*), and everything described in that book (*uraitta poruḷkaḷellam nūlānūliṉ*) can be inferred [as well] (*aṉumāṉam eṉṉil*), you cannot know (*aṟaiyāy*) the existence of the higher worlds [heaven] and the nether worlds [hell] (*paralōka pātāḷa lōkaṅkaḷ*) without a book describing them (*orucollāl uraitta nūliṉṟi*). They cannot be known (*avaiyaṟintapaṭi iṉṟēl*) by your inference (*uṉatu aṉumāṉam aṉṟē*). You do not have the means of knowledge (*piramāṇam uṉakkillai*) explained above [here] (*mēluraikkum*). Only [authoritative scriptures] such as the Āgamas (*ākamamē*) can shed light on topics not explained (*viḷakkuvatu viṭṭa poruḷ*) by perception and inference (*kāṭci aṉumāṉam*).

VERSE 107

epporuḷum anittameṉa iyampiṭuvai anittam illataṟkō uḷḷataṟkō
uḷatilatā ṉataṟkō
ceppiṭiṉ illataṟku illatu eṉṟum illai ceṉṟaṭaivatu uḷḷataṟkēl uḷḷatueṉṟum
uṇṭām
appaṭitāṉ uḷatilatām apporuḷukku eṉṉiṉ uḷatuilatu ākātuilatum uḷḷatu
ākātu
ipporuḷukku anittamilai eṉṟoṉṟaik kāṭṭāy eṉitiltōṉṟum poruḷ niṉṟiṅku
iṟuti yāmē.

[The Buddhist theory of "impermanence" is questioned.[420] "Does this theory apply to both beings and non-beings? If you say it applies to non-beings, they are always non-existent. If it applies to beings, they could never cease to exist. All things that appear undergo changes (some rapidly and some slowly), and eventually meet their end"].

TRANSLATION:

You hold that all substances are impermanent (*epporuḷum anittameṉa iyampiṭuvai*). Is this impermanence (*anittam*) applicable to non-beings [lifeless matter] (*illataṟkō*), souls (*uḷḷataṟkō*) and evolving [souls] (*uḷatilatā ṉataṟkō*)? If you say [it relates to] the non-existent (*illataṟku ceppiṭiṉ*), then non-existent [objects] are never present (*illatu eṉṟum illai*). [If it relates to] the souls [beings], then, it means (*uḷḷataṟkēl eṉṟum uṇṭām*) what exists will be preserved forever (*uḷḷatu ceṉṟaṭaivatu*). If you say [that it relates to] evolving objects (*uḷatilatām apporuḷukku eṉṉiṉ*), then existing objects cannot become non-existent (*appaṭitāṉ uḷatu ilatu ākātu*) and non-existing objects cannot become existent (*ilatum uḷḷatu ākātu*). If you ask me to show you a permanent object (*oṉṟaik anittamilai ipporuḷ*

[420] Impermanence (*anitya* in Sanskrit and *anittam* in Tamil) is a fundamental tenet that all formations—things that come into being dependent on "causes and conditions"—are impermanent. See KEOWN 2004:15.

kāṭṭāy), [I will say] what appears [in the material world] as an object stays here [in the world] (*tōṉṟum poruḷ niṉṟiṅku*) and meets its end (*iṟuti yāmē*).[421]

VERSE 108

aṅkuramvit tiṉkēṭṭil tōṉṟum atupōla aṉaitturuvam keṭṭuvaḻi yākum eṉṉiṉ
aṅkavaṟṟukku ākkakkēṭu aṟaintāy ellām anittameṉum uraimaṟantāy
arukaṉum āṉāy nī
iṅkumuḷai ilaimaramāy eḻuntuīṇṭic cellātu iṟantatē eḻuntapaṭi nillātu eṉṉiṉ
maṅkiyiṭā tēpāla taruṇavirut taiyāy varumvaṭivu tirintuniṉṟu māyum kāṇē.

["You say that just as the seed is destroyed as it sprouts, so are all forms of life born out of destruction. You seem to have forgotten your previous line of argument about impermanence. Now you suggest that something appears and grows, from which something else appears. You seem to be holding views similar to those of the Jains. Understand that without any decay, the body undergoes changes, and all forms exist for a while and die"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that when a seedling appears (*aṅkuram tōṉṟum eṉṉiṉ*), it destroys the seed [in the process], (*vittiṉ kēṭṭil*), and similarly (*atupōla*) all forms (*aṉaitturuvam*) [of life] come about from destruction [from its cause] (*vaḻi yākum keṭṭu*). You declared that all (*aṅku avaṟṟukku aṟaintāy*) [in the phenomenal world] have a beginning and a destruction [cause and effect] (*ākka kēṭu*). You have forgotten your exposition of impermanence of everything (*urai anittameṉum ellām maṟantāy*). You have become a Jain (*nī arukaṉum āṉāy*) and say that the

[421] The reference here is to the concept that only the gross body meets its death but not the subtle body.

seedling (*muḷai*), the leaves (*ilai*), and the tree (*maramāy*) do not proliferate [forever] (*eḻuntuīṇṭic cellātu eṉṉiṉ*) and do not stay in the same state (*eḻuntapaṭi nillātu*), and are subject to demise (*iṟantatē*). Understand that (*kāṇē*), without any decay (*maṅkiyiṭātē*), the body has different forms (*varumvaṭivu*) from that of an infant (*pāla*) to a youth (*taruṇa*) and to an old person (*viruttaiyāy*). They exist for a while (*tirintuniṉṟu*) and die (*māyum*).

VERSE 109

uṭalpūtam eṉiloṉṟukku oṉṟupakai oṉṟā utiracuk kilameṉṉiṉ
marattiṉuḷu kalliṉ
iṭamākat tavaḷaiuru vantavāṟu iyampāy iruviṉaikāṇ eṉilviṉaikaḷ
iraṇṭuuruvāy niṟkum
tiṭamāka vaṉṉamuru eṉiluṇṇa uṇṇac ceṉṟuvaḷa ruṅkāyam
tēyumuṇarvu eṉṉiṉ
maṭavōṉē aruuṇarvuiṅku acētaṉamāy uruvāy vaḷarātu varumillātu
eṉiṉmalarvāṉ varumē.

["If you say that bodies are formed by the union of the elements, how could it be as elements have opposing natures? If you hold that the union of blood and semen forms them, how do you explain the presence of worms in tree-trunks and toads in the cracks of rocks? If you claim that bodies are formed due to karma, how could bad karma and good karma combine to produce forms, as they are mutually exclusive? If you say it is because of nourishment, how is it that the nourishment that helps a young body to grow, does not produce the same result in an old body? If you suggest that it is due to intelligence, how could formless intelligence grow? If you claim that nothingness is the form, then it is stupidity. Yes, you can pick flowers in the sky!"].

TRANSLATION:

If the body is formed by elements (*uṭal pūtam*), they are hostile to each other (*pakai oṉṟā oṉṟukku oṉṟu*). If it is due to the [combination of] blood and semen

(*utira cukkilam*), explain to me (*iyampāy*) the existence of worms in trees (*marattiṉuḷu uru vantavāṟu*) and the frogs in rocks (*tavaḷai kalliṉ iṭamāka*). If it is because of the two karmic acts (*iruviṉaikāṇ eṉil*), the two karmas [good and bad] are mutually exclusive (*viṉaikaḷ iraṇṭu uruvāy niṟkum*). If it is said definitely that the form is due to food (*tiṭamāka uru aṉṉam*), the body (*kāyam*) which grows (*ceṉṟu vaḷarum*) by eating (*uṇṇa uṇṇa*) will also decay (*tēyum*). You idiot (*maṭavōṉē*)! If it is due to consciousness/intelligence (*uṇarvu eṉṉiṉ*), then formless consciousness cannot grow (*aruuṇarvu vaḷarātu*); it will be a form without consciousness (*uruvāy acētaṉamāy*). If nothingness is the form (*varumillātu eṉiṉ*), then they can be called flowers in the sky (*malarvāṉ varumē*).

VERSE 110

eṉṟumilātu oṉṟiṉṟāy varumuruvam vittiṉ eḻumarampōl eṉiṉvittiṉ
uṇṭāyniṉṟu eḻumkāṇ
niṉṟatēl vittiṉmaram kaṇṭatillai eṉṉiṉ nelkamukāy nīḻātu nellāyē
nīḻum
oṉṟiloṉṟu aṅku ilāmaiyiṉāl utiyā kāraṇam peṟṟu utippatukā riyam
atuvum uḷḷatākum
maṉṟamatik kalaipōlak kantam aintum maruviyuḷatu eṉumuraiyum
maṟantaṉaiyō iṉṟē.

["We advocate the 'cause and effect' theory. Have you ever seen a tree grow out of anything other than a seed? The seed is the cause and the tree is the effect. If you claim that, the tree is in its subtle form within the seed, no matter how intensely you examine the seed you will never see a tree in it. Furthermore, the potentiality of the tree is contained in the seed, and a seed can produce only a particular tree of its own kind. Have you forgotten your own theory that the five *skandha*s constitute a form just as the moon is formed by the beams of light?"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that forms can be created from void (*varum uruvam eṉṟumilātu eṉiṉ*) as a tree out of a seed (*vittiṉ eḻumarampōl*), [then we say that] the tree appears

and grows from the seed (*niṉṟu eḻum vittiṉ uṇṭāy*). Not a tree has been seen (*maram kaṇṭatillai*) which does not come out of a seed (*niṉṟatēl vittiṉ*). A paddy grain will not grow into [produce] an Areca palm tree (*nel nīḻātu kamukāy*) but will produce only rice (*nellāyē nīḻum*). What does not exist (*aṅku ilāmaiyiṉāl*) cannot be produced (*utiyā*). It should be known that (*atuvum uḷḷatākum*), due to a cause (*kāraṇam peṟṟu*), an effect arises (*kāriyam utippatu*). Today [now] (*iṉṟē*), have you failed to recall your exposition (*maṟantaṉaiyō eṉumuraiyum*) that just as the bright beams make the full moon (*maṉṟamatik kalaipōla*), the union of (*maruviyuḷatu*) the five skandhas (*kantam aintum*) [constitute the form]?

VERSE 111

uruvamelām pūtaupā tāya cuttāṭ ṭakauruvam eṉṉiṉnī ulavattukku
maruvumaṉa lōṭunīr maṇkantam iratam
vaṉṉamilai vaṉṉikku vaḷinīrmaṇ vācam tarumiratam ilainīrkkut
taḻalkālmaṇ kantam
tāṉillai talattiṉukkuc calamaṉalkālkūṭi varuvatuilai intiriya
viṭayamāṉa
māpūtaṅ kaḷum aṟiyāy matiketṭ ṭāyē.

[The Buddhist holds that bodies are formed by the combination of four elements and their characteristics. The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out the impossibility of this position. The elements and their characteristics are all objects of senses and, as such, cannot be part of consciousness or the intelligence of the forms].

TRANSLATION:

You say that all forms (*uruvam elām eṉṉiṉ nī*) are produced by the combination of the [four] elements and their [four] characteristics (*pūta upātāya cuttāṭṭaka*).[422]

[422] *Cuttāṭṭakam* is a Buddhist generic term for the eight categories comprising the four elements and their characteristics (*nilam*, *nīr*, *neruppu*, *kāṟṟu*, *kantam*, *cuvai*, *uruvam*, and *paricam*). *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "Cuttāṭṭakam" (p. 1512)*.

To form air (*ulavattukku maruvum*), [other elements or attributes such as] color of fire (*vaṉṉam aṉalōṭu*), water (*nīr*), earth (*maṇ*), and smell (*kantam*) cannot be united (*iratam ilai*) [because of their opposing natures]. [To form] fire (*vaṉṉikku*), [other elements or attributes such as] air (*vaḷi*), water (*nīr*), earth (*maṇ*), and smell (*vācam*) cannot be united (*iratam ilai*) [because of their opposing natures]. [To form] water (*nīrkku*), [other elements or attributes such as] fire (*taḻal*), air (*kāl*), earth (*maṇ*), and smell (*kantam*) cannot be united (*tāṉ illai*) [because of their opposing natures]. [To form] earth (*talattiṉukku*), [other elements, or attributes such as] water (*calam*), fire (*aṉal*), and air (*kāl*) do not unite (*kūṭi varuvatuilai*) [because of their opposing natures]. You do not know that these elements and their attributes (*māpūtaṅ kaḷum aṟiyāy*) are objects of senses (*intiriya viṭayamāṉa*) because of your ignorance (*mati keṭṭāyē*).

VERSE 112

maruttueṇṇey taṉilmaruntu niṉṟāṟ pōla maṟaintueṭṭum cūkkumamāy
maruvum eṉṉil
tiruttumavaṉ maruntueṇṇey cērttāṟ pōlac cērppavaṉ vēṟu uṇṭuellā
uruvam eṭṭum
poruttiyatēl orutaṉmai yāmporuḷkaḷ oṉṟiṉ kuṇamoṉṟil pukātu aṟaikai
poruḷaṟiyāy pūta
urupporuḷvēṟu upātāyap poruḷvēṟu kāṭṭāy upātāyam pūtakuṇam
kuṇakuṇiyām ulakē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out that the Buddhists do not distinguish between the elements and their characteristics. If they hold that the oil and herbs in the medicinal oil appear separately in their subtle form, then we need a god just as a physician is needed to mix the herbs and the oil. The elements and their characteristics are inextricably mixed together, and they cannot be realized independent of each other].

TRANSLATION:

Just as the medicine in medicinal oil (*maruntu maruttu eṇṇey*) is [imperceptible] (*niṉṟāṟ pōla*), the eight [elements and their attributes] (*eṭṭum*) disappear [lose their individual identity] (*maṟaintu*) but stay united (*maruvum*) in their subtle form [imperceptible] (*cūkkumamāy*). Just as the one who corrects the problem [a physician] (*tiruttum avaṉ pōla*), mixes [prepares] the medicine with the oil (*maruntu eṇṇey cērttāṟ*), there is a creator (*cērppavaṉ vēṟu uṇṭu*). If all forms (*ellā uruvam*) result from the union (*poruttiyatēl*) of these eight [elements and their attributes] (*eṭṭum*), then all objects should be identical (*poruḷkaḷ orutaṉmai yām*). The qualities of one [object] (*oṉṟiṉ kuṇam*) do not enter another (*oṉṟil pukātu*). You do not know what you speak of (*poruḷaṟiyāy aṟaikai*). Show me [demonstrate your knowledge about] the difference (*vēṟu kāṭṭāy*) between the elements (*urup poruḷ*) and their attributes (*upātāyap poruḷ*). The inseparableness (*kuṇakuṇiyām*)[423] of the qualities of elements (*pūta kuṇam*) and their attributes (*upātāyam*) is [the nature of] the world (*ulakē*).

VERSE 113

aḻintuṇarvai uṇarvutarum eṉiṉ aḻintatu ākkātu āmuṇarvil
poruḷviṉaikaḷ aṇaiyā vākum
aḻintiṭuvatu ākkieṉiṉ muṉṉorukā lattē aṟivuiraṇṭu nillātaṅku aṟakkēṭu iṉṟi
aḻintuṇarvai uṇarvutarum eṉiṉnittā nittam aṭaiyum uṇarvukku anitta māyē cellātu
aḻinteruvai ākkuvatu pōl ākkum eṉṉil āmporuḷ vēṟu aḻintucatti kiṭantu ākkum avaiyē.

[If the intelligence dies at one moment and is regenerated the next moment, it means that what is dead can give rise to life. How would the new intelligence thus born function and perform what the old intelligence was performing and how

[423] *kuṇa-kuṇi-pāvam* is a state of inseparableness as an object and its attributes. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "kuṇa-kuṇi-pāvam" (p. 981)*.

it was functioning. If the Buddhist claims it is akin to how old straw and leaves decompose to become manure and produce new plants, just as the old intelligence dies and creates new intelligence, there is a flaw in such an argument. The old straw and leaves do not decompose completely and maintain their subtle energy, which is transferred to the new plant. Unlike the analogy, according to the Buddhist, two succeeding moments cannot be alive simultaneously; the appearance of a new moment means the death of the previous moment].

TRANSLATION:

If you hold that the decaying [moment] of consciousness (*uṇarvai aḻintu eṉiṉ*) produces the [succeeding moments of] consciousness (*uṇarvu tarum*), [it is established that] what is destroyed could not produce (*aḻintatu ākkātu ām*). [The nascent moment of] consciousness cannot remember (*uṇarvil aṇaiyā vākum*) the things and the deeds [of the previous moment] (*poruḷ viṉaikaḷ*). If it is said that the new intelligence created (*aṟivu ākki eṉiṉ*) prior to the annihilation of the previous moment (*muṉṉoru kālattē aḻintiṭuvatu*), then the two of them cannot be concomitant (*iraṇṭu nillātu aṅku*). If you say that the consciousness does not expire completely (*uṇarvai kēṭu iṉṟi aṟa eṉiṉ*) but gives rise to new consciousness and succumbs (*uṇarvu tarum aḻintu*), then consciousness becomes (*uṇarvukku aṭaiyum*) both existent and non-existent (*nittā nittam*). [So,] it is unacceptable [to say] that it [consciousness] is impermanent (*anittamāyē cellātu*). If you say that just as the dead and decaying [vegetation] becomes manure (*eruvai ākkuvatu aḻintu pōl eṉṉil*), [old consciousness] gives rise (*ākkum*) [to new consciousness], [know that] the decaying matter (*aḻintu āmporuḷ*) is converted into energy (*catti*), which nourishes (*ākkum avaiyē*) new [plant life] (*vēṟu*).

VERSE 114

kēṭilāc cantāṉattē palikkum eṉṟu kiḷakkumnī cantāṉam nittam ākum
ōṭunīr pōl aḻintām uṇarvoḻukkam eṉṉil oḻukunīr iṭṭatellām uṭaṉ kaḻital pōlat
tēṭuporuḷ cīlampā vaṉai kuṟiviñ ñāṉam ceṉṟa uṇar vōṭuēkum

niṉṟuṇarviṉ ēyā
nīṭunīr muṉṉoḻikik keṭātuniṟaintu ōṭum nikaḻuṇarvum kēṭiṉṟi niṟaintu celum kāṇē.

["If you say that consciousness is an aggregate of succession of moments of consciousness, then their continuity must be eternal. If you compare it to the flow of water in a stream, then everything associated with a particular moment will be washed away and lost for the succeeding moment. If you claim that there is no break in the consciousness just as in the flow of water, then this consciousness cannot be momentary and must be eternal"].

TRANSLATION:

According to your explanation (*kiḷakkum nī*),[424] because of the uninterrupted succession [of moments of consciousness] (*kēṭilāc cantāṉattē*), [*intelligence*] emerges (*palikkum*). [If so], the succession [of moments of consciousness] is eternal (*cantāṉam nittam ākum*). If you say that consciousness behaves as the disappearance of the running water [in a stream] (*uṇarvu oḻukkam aḻintām ōṭunīr pōl eṉṉil*), then just as the running stream of water (*oḻukunīr iṭṭatellām*) carries away everything with it (*uṭaṉ kaḻital pōla*), your past accumulation of virtuous conduct (*tēṭuporuḷ cīlam*), mental reflection (*pāvaṉai*), good intention (*kuṟi*), and true knowledge (*viññāṉam*) will die along with the disappearing consciousness (*ceṉṟa uṇar vōṭuēkum*). [They] will not be with the new consciousness (*niṉṟuṇarviṉ ēyā*). Realize that just as the copious amount of water behaves and runs (*nīṭu nīr muṉṉoḻiki ōṭum kāṇē*) in an uninterrupted flow (*keṭātuniṟaintu*), the passing of consciousness [also] (*uṇarvum nikaḻ*) is an uninterrupted flow (*kēṭiṉṟi niṟaintu celum*).

VERSE 115

---

[424] The Tamil word *kiḷakkum* appears to be an archaic word and is not found in Tamil Lexicon. I have translated it as "explain" (*viḷaṅku - viḷakkum*) from the context.

cantāṉam kāraṇamō kāriyamō iraṇṭiṉ taṉmaiyatō kāraṇamum kāriyamum nittam
vantārum cantāṉam toṭarccieṉiṉ ataṟkum varunittam tōṟṟakkēṭu aṭaitaliṉmaṟṟu oṉṟēl
aintāṉa kantaṅkaḷ aṉṟāy nittam aṭaiporuḷām aṟivum aṟivu aṭaivum iṉṟic
cintāmuṉ piṉṉākip piṉmuṉ ākit tirintuvarum tirivaṟintu tērā tērē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin wants to know if the Buddhists' idea of "uninterrupted succession" of consciousness refers to the cause or the effect or both. If the consciousness is the cause, it must be eternal; if it is the effect, then also it is eternal. If it is cause and effect, and as it manifests repeatedly, again, it is also eternal. If consciousness is separate, then it has to be different from the external senses, and will become an eternal object. From this observation, the Śaiva Siddhāntin reasons that the Sautrāntika Buddhists, instead of knowing the consciousness as subject and the other things as the objects, reverse the order. The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out the absurdity].

TRANSLATION:

Is the succession [of moments of consciousness] due to the cause (*cantāṉam kāraṇamō*),[425] due to the effect (*kāriyamō*), or is it the inherent nature of both (*taṉmaiyatō iraṇṭiṉ*)? Both the cause and the effect (*kāraṇamum kāriyamum*) are eternal (*nittam*). If you say that the succession of rising knowledge [cause and effect] continues (*cantāṉam vantārum toṭarcci eṉiṉ*), then because it undergoes appearance and destruction (*aṭaitaliṉ tōṟṟakkēṭu*), it also becomes eternal (*varu nittam ataṟkum*). If you say it [consciousness] is separate from the five *skandha*s [five mental states] (*maṟṟu oṉṟēl aintāṉa kantaṅkaḷ*), then it will [also] become an eternal object (*nittam poruḷām aṭai*). Instead of knowing the consciousness (*iṉṟic*

[425] The Tamil word *cantāṉam* has several meanings. In this context it means an "uninterrupted succession." See *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "cantāṉam" (p. 1266)*.

aṟivum) as a subject and other things as objects (*aṟivu aṭaivum*), you have made the former the latter (*muṉ piṉṉāki*) and the latter the former (*piṉ muṉāki*) [i.e., reversed the sequence], making the consciousness the object (*tirintuvarum*) and senses the subject (*tirivaṟintu*). You Bauddha, investigate (*tērā tērē*)!

VERSE 116

orukālattu uṇarvuketṭām eṉiṉ utippuīṟu oṉṟām oruporuḷiṉ
tirivuṉakkuk kālam āṉāl
varukālam nikaḻkālam kaḻikālam eṉṟu vaḻaṅkuvateṉ poruḷvaravu
nilaikaḻivāl iṉṟēl
tirikālam ceppiṭāy poruṭceyalum oṉṟām ceyalmūṉṟum orukaṇattē
cērum eṉṉil
tarukālam mūṉṟākum tāmarainūṟu itaḻil taḷūci yumkālam
mūṉṟiṉaiyum tarumē.

[The negation of the concept of "Time" by the Buddhist school is examined. Aruṇanti points out the absurdity in the Buddhist position when they claim that the demise and emergence of consciousness occurs simultaneously. Should that be so, then destruction and creation become one single activity! If Buddhists agree that there is no time element involved when an object undergoes changes, why do they talk about past, present, and future time?[426] If the Buddhists deny the time element when an object is born and undergoes changes, then they should not recognize the three periods of time. Three periods of time can be perceived even in activity of very short duration akin to passing a needle through a stack of one hundred lotus petals].

TRANSLATION:

If you suggest that consciousness dies at a particular instant [and reappears] (*uṇarvu keṭṭām orukālattu eṉiṉ*), then both the appearance and demise become

[426] This line of argument by Aruṇanti is not clear.

one (*utippu īṟu oṉṟām*). [If, according] to you (*uṉakku*), the changes an object undergoes represent time (*tirivu oruporuḷiṉ kālam āṉāl*), why do you state (*vaḻaṅkuvateṉ eṉṟu*) that there are [three periods], the future (*varukālam*), the present (*nikaḻkālam*), and the past (*kaḻikālam*)? If an object does not go through (*poruḷ iṉṟēl*) birth (*varavu*), sustenance (*nilai*), and demise (*kaḻivāl*), and if you do not say [accept] the three periods of time (*tirikālam ceppiṭāy*), then all objects are due to one act of creation (*poruḷ oṉṟām ceyalum*). If you say that the three acts take place at the [same] single instant (*ceyalmūṉṟum cērum oru kaṇattē eṉṉil*), still there are three periods of time (*mūṉṟākum kālam*). If you pierce one hundred petals of a lotus with a needle (*nūṟu tāmarai itaḻil ūciyum taḷ*), it will display the three periods of time (*kālam mūṉṟiṉaiyum tarumē*).

VERSE 117

uṇarvukā raṇamuṇarvukku eṉiṉnittam uṇarvukku uṇṭāki niṉṟuṇarvai utippi yātuiṅku
uṇarvucan tāṉaviṭattu oḻintāl piṉṉai uṇṭākātu uṭaluṇarvukku upātāṉam eṉṉiṉ
uṇarvuuṭaliṉ iṭaiyaṟātu utikka vēṇṭum uṭaluṇarviṉ viṉaiyiṉāl uṇarvu utikkum eṉṉiṉ
uṇarvuviṉai uḻatu oṭuṅkātu uṇarvutarum ceyti uṇarvaiviṉai tariṉ oruvaṉ ceyalviṉaiyiṉṟu āmē.

["According to you, one moment of consciousness gives rise to another moment of consciousness. Your theory of impermanence does not support such a position. An impermanent moment of consciousness cannot become permanent to give rise to another moment of consciousness. If you claim that the body generates consciousness/knowledge, then the body must display active intelligence even during deep sleep. If you claim that bodily senses cause intelligence, then as the senses are always active, the intelligence created must be eternal. If karma produces consciousness, then karma is consciousness itself. It means any act by a person will not affect the karma"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say [one moment of] consciousness causes [another moment of] consciousness (*uṇarvu uṇarvukku kāraṇam eṉiṉ*), consciousness thus born cannot be eternal (*uṇarvukku uṇṭāki nittam*) and generate another consciousness (*utippiyātu uṇarvai*). If consciousness [appears and] dies in succession (*uṇarvu oḻintāl cantāṉa viṭattu*), it cannot generate [another consciousness] after its [death] (*uṇṭākātu piṉṉai*). If you say that the body is the material cause for consciousness (*uṭal upātāṉam uṇarvukku eṉṉiṉ*), then consciousness must be arising (*uṇarvu utikka vēṇṭum*) in the body without interruption (*uṭaliṉ iṭaiyaṟātu*) [that is, even when you are asleep]. If you hold that the senses of the body create consciousness (*uṇarviṉ uṭal utikkum uṇarvu eṉṉiṉ*), then that consciousness will never cease to exist (*uṇarvu oṭuṅkātu*). [Know that] consciousness gives rise to actions [karma] (*uṇarvu tarum ceyti*). If you say that karma causes consciousness (*viṉai uṇarvai tariṉ*), then it amounts to the idea that actions of a person (*oruvaṉ ceyal āmē*) will not have any karma [at all] (*viṉaiyiṉṟu*).

VERSE 118

viṉaiyuṇarvu tarumviṉaiyai uṇarvutarum eṉṟum viḷampiṉ nī
uṇarvupōl viṉaiyiṉukku
niṉaivuvarum oṉṟaiyoṉṟu nikaḻtti ṭāpiṉ nilaiyiṉmai yālnikaḻattik
keṭutal ceyyā
kaṉalviṟakil piṟantataṉaip poṭicey tāṟpōl karuttu viṉaiyil tōṉṟik
kaḻikkumviṉai eṉṉiṉ
muṉamuṇarvu piṟantaḷavē viṉaikeṭukkum muṉpiṉ utiyātu
mukiḻneruppiṉ viṟakuutiyā āṟē.

[The discussion about karma continues, and Aruṇanti denies that either consciousness can create karma, or karma can create consciousness. Unlike consciousness, karma has no memory, and it is non-intelligent. Just as the fire produced from a piece of firewood consumes the firewood itself, consciousness

produced from karma will destroy karma itself. Such a claim by the Buddhist is deceptive because the moment consciousness is born, it destroys karma, and there can be no further production in succession. Just as the fire, which consumes the firewood, cannot produce another piece of firewood, consciousness too cannot produce karma].

TRANSLATION:

You hold that karma produces consciousness[427] (*nī eṉṟum viḷampiṉ viṉai uṇarvu tarum*) and consciousness [in turn] produces karma (*uṇarvu viṉaiyai tarum*). Similar to consciousness (*uṇarvu pōl*), [even] karma has [should have] memory (*viṉaiyiṉukku niṉaivu varum*). [However, it is not so, as] they cannot produce (*nikaḻtti ṭāpiṉ*) each other (*oṉṟaiyoṉṟu*). Due to impermanence (*nilaiyiṉmaiyāl*), they cannot [just] happen [produce] and expire (*nikaḻattik keṭutal ceyyā*). If you say that just as the fire produced (*kaṉal piṟantataṉai pōl eṉṉiṉ*) from the firewood reduces it to dust [ashes] (*viṟakil ceytāṟ poṭi*), knowledge born out of karma (*viṉaiyil tōṉṟik karuttu*) will destroy the karma [itself] (*viṉai kaḻikkum*). Know that (*āṟē*), as soon as knowledge is born (*uṇarvu piṟantaḷavē*), it will destroy the karma (*viṉai keṭukkum*) and it cannot initiate [new knowledge] (*utiyātu*) before or after [the process of succession] (*muṉpiṉ*). [More] firewood (*viṟaku*) does not appear (*utiyā*) from the fire (*neruppiṉ*) which burns [the firewood] (*mukiḻ*).

VERSE 119

pēyumnara karuñcurarum piramarumāy ulakil pitāmātā ātāram
oṉṟum iṉṟik
kāyamoṭu tāmvaruvar eṉṟuraippai kāyam kāriyamāy varutaliṉāl
kāraṇam uṇṭākum
āyumuṇar vōcutta aṭṭakamō kaṉmam vaṭittatō vaṭivuceytu vaittārum
uṇṭō

---

[427] As pointed out earlier, the poet often uses the words “consciousness” (*uṇarvu*) and “knowledge” (*ñāṉam*) interchangeably.

āyumaṟivu uṇṭākil aṟaintiṭāy ulakukku ātituṇai nimittkā raṇamaṟivatu aṟivē.

["You claim that devils, demons, and celestials appear on earth without a father and mother. If the body is the effect, then there must be a cause. If you agree, how is this body created? By consciousness? By elements and their categories? By karma? By whom? If you investigate the questions posed, you may be able to arrive at some answers. The phenomenal world has an instrumental cause, an efficient cause, and a material cause, and to know them is real wisdom"].

TRANSLATION:

You pronounce that devils, demons from the nether world, and Brahmā (*pēyum acurarum narakaruñ piramarumāy eṉṟu uraippai*) will appear embodied (*kāyamoṭu tām varuvar*) without a father, and mother (*oṉṟum iṉṟik pita mātā*), or other basis (*ātāram*). Because the body is the result of an effect (*kāyam kāriyamāy varutaliṉāl*), there must be a cause for its appearance (*kāraṇam uṇṭākum*). [Is that body] created by investigating consciousness (*vaṭittatō āyum uṇarvō*), or by the four elements and their categories (*cutta aṭṭakam*)[428], or by karma (*kaṉmam*), or by an agent creating the bodies (*vaṭivuceytu vaittārum uṇṭō*)? If you gain the knowledge by investigation (*aṟivu uṇṭākil āyum*), tell me (*aṟaintiṭāy*)! The [phenomenal] world has a primary [cause] (*ulakukku āti*), an instrumental [cause] (*tuṇai*), and an efficient cause (*nimitta kāraṇam*). It is erudition (*aṟivē*) to learn that (*aṟivatu*).

VERSE 120

uruvāti kantaṅkaḷ aintum kūṭi oruvaṉ vēṟu oruvaṉ ilai eṉṟuraikkum puttā
uruvāti aintiṉaiyum uṇarpavaṉvēṟu eṉṉa uṇarumviñ ñāṉameṉṟāy ñāṉam uṇarntavar ār

[428] See the footnote, verse 111.

uruvāti poruḷ kāṭṭit taṉaikkāṭṭum cuṭarpōl uṇarvupiṟi tiṉaiyuṇarttit taṉaiyuṇarttum eṉṉiṉ
uruvāti poruḷiṉaiyum cuṭariṉaiyum kāṇum ulōcaṉampōl uṇarvuporuḷ uṇarpavaṉ vēṟu uṇṭē.

["Bauddha! You hold that other than the five aggregates, there is nothing else. You deny the existence of a soul. You claim that only the faculty of consciousness, the intellect, perceives and understands the five aggregates. When asked about the intellect, you say that just as a lamp shows itself and throws light on objects around it, the intellect knows itself and learns about the objects around it. However, you must be cognizant of the fact that just as the eyes witness both the lamp and the objects around it, there must be an agent (the soul) which is conscious of both the intellect and the other senses"].

TRANSLATION:

Bauddha! (*Puttā*)! You hold that the union of the five aggregates (*kūṭi kantaṅkaḷ aintum eṉṟuraikkum*) such as body, etc. (*uruvāti*)[429] constitute an individual (*oruvaṉ*) and there is nothing else [besides, a soul] (*vēṟu oruvaṉ ilai*). When told that the knower of the five [aggregates] (*uṇarpavaṉ uruvāti aintiṉaiyum eṉṉa*) is different (*vēṟu*), you replied that it is the faculty of consciousness (*vinñāṉam eṉṟāy*) that understands (*uṇarumviñ*) [them]. [When questioned] who realized this knowledge (*ār uṇarntavar ñāṉam*), you say that just as the flame of a lamp sheds light on objects [around it] (*cuṭarpōl poruḷ kāṭṭi eṉṉiṉ*) as well as lights up itself (*taṉaikkāṭṭum*), consciousness, besides revealing itself (*uṇarvu taṉaiyuṇarttum*), reveals other [things also] (*uṇarttit piṟtiṉaiy*). [You must know that] just as the eyes (*ulōcaṉam pōl*), which notice both the object (*poruḷiṉaiyum kāṇum*) and the

[429] One of the usages of the Tamil word "*āti*" is to use it as an affix as "…this and the rest". The word "*uruvāti*" means "body, etc." referring to the five aggregates—body, sensation, perception, reflection, and consciousness. The word is used four times in this verse, but only the first usage seems to be relevant and the other three are redundant. The usage is probably for poetic effect.

flame (*cuṭariṉaiyum*), there must be a different agent (*vēṟu uṇṭē*), which is conscious of this knowledge (*uṇarpavaṉ uṇarvuporuḷ*).

VERSE 121

kāyamuṭaṉ intiriyam maṉamnāṉ eṉṟu kataṟuvāy kāyamuṟak kattu
aṟiyā vākum
vāyilkaḷum appaṭiyil oṉṟai oṉṟaṅku aṟiyā maṉamkaṇattiṟ keṭumkāla
mūṉṟiṉvaravu aṟiyātu
āyumuṇar vākiuṭal poṟimaṉammūṉṟu aṟintāṅku avaināṉal lēṉeṉṟum
aṟintumaṉat tālē
ēyumoru poruḷ karuti intiriyap pale icaivittuk kāyattāl iyaṟṟuvatu āṉ
māvē.

[This verse establishes the autonomous nature of the soul. The Buddhist is being addressed: “You shout that there is no different entity called the soul other than the body, the senses, and the mind. [Remember that] while asleep, both the body and the senses are not conscious. Even while awake, each sense has no knowledge of what the other senses are aware of. Furthermore, as your mind is momentary, it cannot perceive the three periods of time, the present, the past, and the future. It is the soul, which perceives the body, the mind, and the senses, and at the same time knows it is different from them. The soul is conscious of the objects in contact with the mind and it orchestrates the actions with the sense organs of the body].

TRANSLATION:

You scream that “I am [the sum total of] the body (*nāṉ kāyam kataṟuvāy*), the sense organs (*intiriyam*), and the mind (*maṉam*)”. [However,] the body does not know (*kāyam aṟiyā vākum*) [i.e., is not aware] during sleep (*uṟakkattu*). Similarly

(*appaṭiyil*), even the sense organs (*vāyilkaḷum*)[430] will not know (*aṟiyā*) each other (*oṉṟai oṉṟaṅku*). Because your mind (*maṉam*) perishes (*keṭum*) in a moment (*kaṇattiṟ*), it will not discern (*aṟiyātu*) the three periods [the past, the present, and the future] (*mūṉṟiṉvaravu*) of time (*kāla*). It is the soul (*āṉmāvē*) which, by investigation (*āyum uṇarvu*), knows (*aṟintāṅku*) the body (*uṭal*), the senses (*poṟi*), and the mind (*maṉam*). It discriminates (*aṟintu*) that "I am not one of those" (*avai nāṉ allēṉ eṉṟum*), becomes conscious of objects (*ēyumoru poruḷ karuti*) in contact with the mind (*maṉat tālē*), and orchestrates (*icaivittuk*) the actions (*iyaṟṟuvatu*) with the sense organs (*intiriyap pālē*) of the body (*kāyattāl*).

VERSE 122

kaḻintavuṇar vēpiṉṉum iyāṉaṟintēṉ eṉṟu karutaliṉ av vuṇarvu
aṟintatu eṉṉiṉ muṉṉē
moḻintamoḻi nāṉmoḻintēṉ eṉṟāl vāytāṉ moḻintatō moḻintavaṉvēṟu
āṉāl pōla
eḻuntauṇarvu ellāmkoṇṭu yāṉaṟintēṉ eṉṟatu etuatukāṉ uyiruṇarvāl
vākkāl maṟṟai
oḻintakā yamtaṉṉāl uṇarnturaittuc ceytaṅku uṇarviṉukkum ātāra
māyniṟkum uyirē.

[This verse continues to address the Buddhist school and negates their concept that equates the soul with the mind. You hold that the knowledge arising from the action of the senses is different from the knowledge arrived at by the mind. You claim that the latter arises at the demise of the former. When I said "I know," who spoke those words? Was it just my mouth? Was the speaker different from me?" The Śaiva Siddhāntin establishes that the soul is responsible in perceiving through the mind, uttering through the mouth, and acting through the body].

---

[430] The Tamil word "*vāyilkaḷ*" could mean either the "five organs of sense" or the "five objects of senses." *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "vāyilkaḷ" (p. 3602)*.

TRANSLATION:

You hold that you became aware of (*iyāṉaṟintēṉ eṉṟu karutaliṉ*) a [transpired moment of consciousness] after its demise (*piṉṉum kaḻinta uṇarvē*). When I uttered (*nāṉ moḻintēṉ eṉṟāl*) those previously spoken words (*muṉṉē moḻintamoḻi*), did my mouth utter those words (*vāytāṉ moḻintatō*)? [Or,] was the speaker different [from me] (*moḻintavaṉ vēṟu*)? Recognize that (*atu kāṇ*) after knowing everything [through the senses] (*ellām eḻunta uṇarvu*), [that which] declares "I know" is the soul (*yāṉ aṟintēṉ eṉṟatu uyir*). It is the soul (*uyirē*), knowing through the mind (*uṇarvāl uṇarntu*), speaking through the mouth (*uraittu vākkāl*), and acting through the body (*ceytaṅku kāyam*) that supports consciousness (*ātāramāy niṟkum uṇarviṉukkum*).

VERSE 123

intiriya vītiyeḻum cittam neñcattu eḻumcittam eṉaviraṇṭum oṉṟu keṭṭē oṉṟu
vantueḻuvatu eṉilkaṉavil kaṇṭapaṭi naṉaviṉ vāytiṟavār naṉavukaṇṭa paṭikaṉaviṟ kāṇār
antaṉuru vaṉṉaṅkaḷ aṟintiṭāṉ iṉṟēl aṟikaṉavum iṟantuuṇarvum aḻintuuṟakkam aṭaintāl
untuvatōr cantāṉam illaiuṇarvu utippa uyirkaṉavu naṉaviṉaiyum uṇarum kāṇē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin continues to address the Sautrāntika Buddhist and establishes that the senses cannot be equated with the soul. "You claim that there are two kinds of minds[431], one arising out of the external senses and the other from the mental senses, the latter appearing following the demise of the former. If that is so, a dream experienced during sleep cannot be remembered when awake. Moreover, the knowledge gained by the external senses is similar

[431] The Tamil word *cittam* refers to the mind. However, in this context it refers to the consciousness or the knowledge gained by the mind.

to that of a person born blind and therefore cannot discern form and color. Hence, you cannot claim that there are two kinds of minds. When one is asleep, that person is not aware of his sense organs. In other words, there is no link between the two minds. However, when that person wakes up, the link is established and the person can remember the dreams. This is not possible unless there is a soul that continues to function when the two minds are absent"].

TRANSLATION:

"If you hold that there are two kinds [of consciousness] (*eṉaviraṇṭum eṉil*), that is, consciousness arising through the path of sense organs (*cittam eḻum vīti intiriya*) and consciousness arising from the mind (*cittam eḻum neñcattu*). You also hold that when one is destroyed the other one manifests itself (*oṉṟu keṭṭē oṉṟu vantueḻuvatu*). What is seen [experienced] in a dream (*kaṇṭapaṭi kaṉavil*) cannot be articulated when awake (*vāytiṟavār naṉaviṉ*), and what is seen [experienced] when awake (*kaṇṭapaṭi naṉavu*) cannot be seen [experienced] in dream (*kaṉaviṟ kāṇār*). A blind person (*antaṉ*) cannot know [see] forms and colors (*uru vaṉṉaṅkaḷ aṟintiṭāṉ*). When one is asleep (*uṟakkam aṭaintāl*) while the dreams are dead [one is not dreaming] (*kaṉavum iṟantu*), and without [waking] consciousness, there is no knowledge (*uṇarvum aḻintu aṟi illai*) of a succession of sense perceptions (*cantāṉam untuvatōr*). See [understand] that when consciousness is regained [on waking up] (*uṇarvu utippa kāṇē*), the soul (*uyir*) remembers (*uṇarum*) both the dream [state] and the waking [state] (*kaṉavu naṉaviṉaiyum*).

VERSE 124

oru kālattu ōriṭattil oruṇarvēl cevitāṉ oṉṟuṇarātu iruceviyum uṇarum ōcai
orukālattu irukaṇṇum iruceviyum maṉamum oruvaṉaikkaṇṭu
avaṉuraikēṭṭu uṇarntiṭum aimpoṟiyum
orukālum uṇarāuḷ ḷuṇarviṉṟip poṟikaḷ oṉṟoṉṟāy uṇarvatuuḷ
ḷuṇarvaintum uṇarā

orukālum poṟivikaṟpittu uṇarāuḷ ḷuṇarvukku uḷḷatukāṇ vikaṟpamiraṇ ṭummuṇarvatu uyirē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin establishes that the soul is responsible for synthesizing all the sensory input. If there is any validity in the Sautrāntika Buddhist claim that knowledge arises due to a particular sense organ at a particular time only, then sound perceived by the two ears could not be perceived by one ear. Furthermore, at the same moment one could see another person with both eyes and could hear that person's words with his two ears and recognize that person's identity. The sense organs cannot act independently without the mind, and what one sense organ perceives, the other organs cannot perceive. Besides all the input from different sense organs need to be integrated, and differentiated, and only the soul can perform that function. Only the soul can understand everything by means of the senses, both internal and external].

TRANSLATION:

[If you say that] a single moment of consciousness arises (*oru uṇarvēl*) at a particular time (*oru kālattu*) and at a particular place (*ōriṭattil*), a single ear (*oṉṟu cevitāṉ*) cannot realize (*uṇarātu*) the sound experienced [heard] by both ears (*ōcai iru ceviyum uṇarum*). At a single moment (*oru kālattu*), when a person looks at another person (*oruvaṉai kaṇṭu*) with both eyes (*irukaṇṇum*), [hears him] with both his ears (*iruceviyum*), and the mind also (*maṉamum*) understands his words (*uṇarntiṭum avaṉ uraikēṭṭu*). The five senses (*aimpoṟiyum*) will never (*orukālum*) realize [perceive anything] without the mind (*uṇarā uḷḷuṇarvu iṉṟi*). What the sense organs perceive [objects] (*poṟikaḷ uṇarvatu*) one-by-one (*oṉṟoṉṟāy*) is not understood by the mind [at the same moment] (*uṇarā*). Without the mind (*uḷḷuṇarvu*), the five senses cannot realize [discern anything] (*aintum uṇarā*). The sense organs will never (*poṟi orukālum*) have the capacity to differentiate

knowledge (*vikaṟpittu uṇarā*)[432]. Only the soul (*uḷḷuṇarvukku*) has the capacity to realize [understand] (*uḷḷatukāṇ*) the differentiated knowledge (*vikaṟpam*). Only the soul realizes [perceives] (*uyirē uṇarvatu*) both [through the mind and through the sense organs] (*iraṇṭum*).

VERSE 125

aruvuṇarvu māyāṟum māṟi māṟi aṅkaṅkē tōṉṟiyiṭil akattunilai iṉṟi
uruviṉoṭu pālataruṇa virutta avattai uṇṭākātu uṟakkattiṉ uṭaltaṭṭa
aḻaippa
varuvatuṇarvu eṅkiruntu neñciliruntu eṉṉil vāyilviṇai aṟintueḻuppa
āyuaṟi yātām
tiriyoḻiya iṭiñciltoṭat tīpameḻātu aṭakkam ceṉṟapoḻu tāluṇarvu
niṉṟanilai ceppē.

[The Sautrāntika Buddhist claims that the formless but conscious mind along with the five senses undergo changes every moment. The Śaiva Siddhāntin refutes such a position by asking, “If the mind is formless how could it unite with the body and undergo changes such as infancy to youth, and to old age? When a person wakes up from sleep, how does he regain his consciousness and where does it come from. If the Buddhist holds that consciousness begins from the mind, it cannot be so because consciousness cannot proceed from the mind and manifest itself through the sense organs. The Śaiva Siddhāntin chides the Sautrāntika Buddhist by suggesting that it is similar to trying to add a wick and oil to a lamp where the flame is extinguished. He also poses a rhetorical question, “When a man temporarily loses consciousness when he faints where does the consciousness reside.”].

TRANSLATION:

---

[432] The Tamil word “*vikaṟpam*” has several meanings; it means “differentiated knowledge” in this context. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "āriyam" (p. 244)*.

If the formless consciousness (*aru uṇarvu*) becomes six (*āṟum*)[433] repeatedly [every moment] (*māṟi māṟi*), and appears here and there (*tōṉṟiyiṭil aṅkaṅkē*), the mind without a form (*akattu nilai iṉṟi*), combining with the body (*uruviṉoṭu*), cannot generate changes in the body (*uṇṭākātu avattai*) from that of an infant (*pāla*), to a youth (*taruṇa*) and to old age (*virutta*). When the body is disturbed (*uṭal taṭṭa aḻaippa*) and aroused from sleep (*uṟakkattiṉ*), where does the consciousness come from (*eṅkiruntu uṇarvu varuvatu*)? If you say it [consciousness] arises from the mind (*neñcil iruntu eṉṉil*), then, on waking up, the mind cannot become conscious (*aṟintueḻuppa āyu aṟiyātām*) through the action of the senses (*viṉai vāyil*). [This is similar to] when the [flame of the] wick is extinguished (*tiri oḻiya*) there will be no light (*tīpam eḻātu*) in the hollow portion of an earthen lamp (*iṭiñciltoṭa*). Tell me (*ceppē*), where does the consciousness exist (*uṇarvu niṉṟanilai*) when a person is unconscious (*aṭakkam ceṉṟapoḻutu*)?

VERSE 126

iccaiveṟuppu iyaṟṟal iṉpam tuṉpam ñāṉam ivaiaṇuviṉ kuṟiyākum
ivaṟṟil iccai
naccinukarntu orupaḻattai iṉamkaṇṭu muṉpu nāṉnukarnta kaṉiyiṉ
iṉam eṉṟunaccal piṉpum
meccaveṟuppu ātikaḻum ippaṭiyē yākum ivaimuṉpum piṉpum uṇarn
tiṭutalālē
niccayakart tāoruvaṉ uḻaṉ eṉṟu nallōr niṟittiṭuvar veṟittiṭuvar
niṉṉuṭaiya poruḻē.

[According to the Śaiva Siddhāntin, the soul is regarded as a repository of desire, hatred, effort, pleasure, suffering, and knowledge. These emotions are explained and the importance of expectations of a future recurrence is stressed. As future experience is envisioned in the characteristics of these emotions experienced by the soul, they must be permanent and not momentary as claimed by the

[433] The mind along with the five other sense organs is counted as the sixth.

Buddhist].

TRANSLATION:

Desire (*iccai*), hatred (*veṟuppu*), exertion (*iyaṟṟal*), pleasure (*iṉpam*), suffering (*tuṉpam*), and knowledge (*ñāṉam*) [describe] the nature of the soul (*aṇuviṉ kuṟiyākum*). Among these (*ivaṟṟil*), desire is (*iccai*) [explained as] having craved for (*nacci*) and having enjoyed (*nukarntu*) a particular fruit (*oru paḻattai*), coming across the same kind (*iṉam kaṇṭu*) [again], [and to remember] the kind of fruit (*kaṉiyiṉ iṉam*) I had enjoyed before (*nāṉ muṉpu nukarnta*) and to long for it again (*naccal piṉpum*). Similar are [the characteristics of] (*ippaṭiyē yākum*) hatred and other qualities (*veṟuppu ātikaḷum*). Because it [the soul] knows (*uṇarntiṭutalālē*) both the future and the past (*muṉpum piṉpum*), good people endorse (*nallōr niṟittiṭuvar*) the existence of a permanent doer [agent] (*oruvaṉ uḷaṉ eṉṟu niccayakarttā*) and they loathe your position (*veṟittiṭuvar niṉṉuṭaiya poruḷē*).

VERSE 127

epporuṭkum irantaramāy iṭamkoṭuttu nīṅkātu iruḷoḷitāṉ aṉṟiiraṇ
ṭiṉukkumiṭa vakaiyāy
oppilkuṇam cattamatāy vāyu āti utittoṭuṅka niṟkumvāṉ uyirmuṉṉē
coṉṉōm
ceppiṭumkā lampoḻutu nāḷ ātiyākit tirivitamāyt tīmainaṉmai ceyyum
tikkut
tappilkuṇak kukkuṭakkut teṟkuvaṭakku āti tāṉākit tiriyātē niṉṟupalam
tarumē.

[The Sautrāntika Buddhist does not recognize the existence of space, time and the cardinal directions, whereas the Śaiva Siddhāntin considers them all as real entities. These are eternal, and those who perform rituals facing the cardinal directions will reap benefits].

TRANSLATION:

The permanent space (*nīṅkātu irantaram*) provides room (*niṟkum iṭam koṭuttu*) for all objects (*epporuṭkum*). It is neither darkness, nor light (*iruḷ aṉṟi oḷitāṉ*), and it accommodates both (*iṭa vakaiyāy iraṇ ṭiṉukkum*). With sound as its incomparable quality (*cattam oppilkuṇam*), space provides room for air and other [elements] (*vāṉ vāyu āti*) to originate and perish (*utittu oṭuṅka*). [The poet says] "We already explained (*muṉṉē coṉṉōm*) [the role of] the soul (*uyir*). The already discussed (*ceppiṭum*) time has periods (*kālam poḻutu*) as days (*nāḷ ātiy*), appears as three [the past, the present, and the future] (*ākit tirivitamāy*), and will do evil and good (*tīmai naṉmai ceyyum*). The eternal cardinal points (*āti tikku*) are east (*kuṇakku*), west (*kuṭakku*), south (*teṟku*), and north (*vaṭakku*). [Those who do not make] a mistake (*tappil*) in facing [proper directions and doing austerities] (*tiriyātē niṉṟu*) will reap the benefits (*palam tarumē*)".

VERSE 128

kāriyamāy ulakamelām irutta lālē kaṭātikaḷpōl kāriyakart tāoruvaṉ vēṇṭum
āriyamāy aṟamporuḷōṭu iṉpamvīṭu ellām aṟaintu uyirkaṭku aṟivuceyal aḷippatunūl annūl
kūriyarāy uḷḷavarkaḷ ōta ōtik koṇṭuvara lālmuṉṉē kuṟṟam iṉṟic
cīriyapēr aṟivuṭaiyōṉ ceppa vēṇṭum ceyaliṉikkum karivēṇṭum civaṉ uḷaṉ eṉṟu aṟiyē.

[The Sautrāntika Buddhist does not acknowledge a creator of the universe nor do they give any credence to the scriptures. The Śaiva Siddhāntin advocates the causal argument and argues that just as a potter is a necessary condition to create a pot, a creator of the universe is a necessary condition. The scriptures that outline the four goals of life[434] also provide guidelines performing duties and

[434] The four aims or goals of life (*puruṣārtha*) are righteousness (*dharma*), material wealth (*artha*), all forms of pleasures (*kāma*), and salvation or liberation (*mokṣa*) (Sanskrit terms in parenthesis). The equivalent Tamil words are *aṟam*, *poruḷ, iṉpam,* and *vīṭu* respectively.

gaining knowledge. For generations these have been chanted by the most erudite seers (and thinkers), and it makes sense that these scriptures must have been composed by an omniscient being who is Śiva, the eternal witness].

TRANSLATION:

Just as there should be a creator of the effect to create the pots [a potter] (*kāriyakarttā kaṭātikaḷpōl*), there must be one [to create] the phenomenal world (*oruvaṉ ulakamelām vēṇṭum*) that is seen as an effect (*irutta lālē kāriyamāy*). The sacred scriptures (*āriyam nūl*)[435] stipulate [the four stages of life] to the humans (*aṟaintu uyirkaṭku*): righteousness (*aṟam*), wealth (*poruḷ*), enjoyment (*iṉpam*), and final liberation (*vīṭu*). [They] provide [instructions about] (*aḷippatu*) knowledge and duties (*aṟivu ceyal*). That scripture (*annūl*), chanted (*ōta*) and continued to be chanted [for generations] (*ōtikkoṇṭu vara*) by [sages] with sharp intellect (*kūriyarāy uḷḷavarkaḷ*), it must have been uttered [transmitted by one] without any blemish (*kuṟṟam iṉṟi ceppa vēṇṭum*), with everlasting great knowledge (*cīriya aṟi pēr vuṭaiyōṉ*). There must be a witness (*kari vēṇṭum*) for all the duties [prescribed] (*ceyaliṉikkum*) [who would] realize that (*aṟiyē*) Śiva exists (*civaṉ uḷaṉ eṉṟu*)!

VERSE 129

maraṅkaḷ uyiralla eṉṟu maṟuttuc coṉṉāy vāṭutalpū rittalāṉ maraṅkaḷ uyirākum
tiraṅkunīr peṟātuoḻiyiṉ peṟilcirattai cērum cīvaṉala eṉil ulakil cīvaṉ ellām
uramkoḷvatu ūṇpeṟil cōrumūṇ peṟāvēl ularntamaram nīrpeṟṟāl uyyātuuḷ ḷuyirkaḷ
karantaciṉai muṭṭaikaṭku vāyiliṉṟu vāyil kaṇṭilatēl pūttukkāyttu

---

[435] The Tamil word "*āriyam"* refers to the Sanskrit language. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "āriyam" (p. 244)*. However, in this context, I speculate that the word indicates the sacred nature of the scriptures.

eḻalmaraṅkaḷ uyirē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin challenges the Sautrāntika Buddhist position that trees do not have life. He substantiates his position by stating that because trees grow and die (evidence of life), and also because they need sustenance—a tree grows when watered and dies if it is not watered. To the Buddhist argument that trees do not have a soul Aruṇanti counters by saying that dead trees do not grow even when watered suggesting that a living tree has more than just a need for sustenance. To the argument that the trees do not have a life because they do not have sense organs, the Śaiva Siddhāntin posits that just as eggs have no sense organs but still have life, the trees may not have sense organs but they display they are alive by producing flowers and fruits].

TRANSLATION:

You denied (*maṟuttuc coṉṉāy*) the existence of life (*uyiralla eṉṟu*) in trees (*maraṅkaḷ*). Because they flourish and perish (*pūrittalāṉ vāṭutal*) trees (*maraṅkaḷ*) do have lives (*uyirākum*). They dry up and die (*tiraṅku oḻiyiṉ*), when they do not get water (*nīr peṟātu*). When they get [water] (*peṟil*), they thrive (*cirattai cērum*). If it is held that it is due to the lack of a soul (*cīvaṉ ala eṉil*) in this world (*ulakil*), all living beings (*cīvaṉ ellām*) gain strength (*uramkoḷvatu*) by getting nourishment (*ūṇpeṟil*), and they languish (*cōrum*) when they do not get food (*ūṇ peṟāvēl*). Because a dead tree (*ularnta maram*) cannot be revived with water (*nīr peṟṟāl uyyātu*), it must have a life (*uḷḷuyirkaḷ*). Roes (*ciṉai*) and eggs (*muṭṭaikaṭku*) do not have sense organs (*vāyil iṉṟu*). [If it is claimed that the] sense organs (*vāyil*) appear later [after they are hatched] (*kaṇṭilatēl*), trees (*maraṅkaḷ*) have life (*uyirē*) because they produce flowers and fruits (*pūttu kāyttu eḻal*).

VERSE 130

orumarattiṉ uyiroṉṟēl kompuōcittu naṭṭāl uyyumuyir oṉṟupala vāmō
eṉṉil
karumarattiṉ vittuvēr kompukoṭi kiḻaṅku kaṇkalantu koḷḷum uyir

aṇṭam vērpput
tarupiṟappuc carāyucaṅkaḷ caṉaṉamumpeṟ ṟāṟpōl tāṉaṭaiyum
uṟpīcam talamnaṭavātu eṉṉil
perunilattil kālilār naṭapparō pētāy piṟappiṉvitam anēkamkāṇ pēcuṅ kālē.

[To the Sautrāntika Buddhist question if one life could split into many similar to a transplanted branch could become alive, the answer is no. To the Buddhist position that unlike the lives born out of fetus, and eggs, trees do not have locomotion and hence they do not have a soul, the Śaiva Siddhāntin retorts that the fact that a lame person cannot walk does not negate that, that person is still human. Creation has infinite varieties].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that because a tree has life (*orumarattiṉ uyiroṉṟēl eṉṉil*), and if we cut a branch [from a tree] and plant it (*kompu ōcittu naṭṭāl*), which [then] gets life (*uyyumuyir*), does that mean one life multiplies into many (*oṉṟu pala vāmō*)? [No]. Souls enter into seeds (*kalantu vittu*), roots (*vēr*), branches (*kompu*), creepers (*koṭi*), bulbous roots (*kiḻaṅku*), and nodes of trees (*marattiṉ kaṇ*) as their womb (*karu*), and assume lives (*koḷḷum uyir*). You say that sprouts appearing [on the trees] (*uṟpīcam tāṉaṭaiyum eṉṉil*) do not walk on earth (*naṭavātu talam*) similar to the lives born out of eggs (*caṉaṉamum aṇṭam peṟṟāṟ pōl*), sweat (*vērpput*)[436], and wombs (*carāyucaṅkaḷ*) that produce lives (*tarupiṟappuc*). You Fool (*pētāy*)! In this great world (*perunilattil*), can a person without legs [lame person] walk (*kālilār naṭapparō*)? When you talk (*pēcuṅ kālē*), be aware that the variations (*vitam kāṇ*) in creation (*piṟappiṉ*) are manifold (*anēkam*).

[436] The Tamil word "*vērpu* (*viyarttal*)" refers to "sweat." *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "vērpu" (p. 3688)*. It is not clear why the poet has included it as a source of life. One commentator suggests it could refer to "*kacivu*", meaning "moist land where water oozes out" MUTALIAR 1910:190.

VERSE 131

tiṉṉumatu kuṟramilai cettatueṉum puttā tiṉpaiyeṉak koṉṟuuṉakkut tīṟriṉarkkup pāvam
maṉṉuvatuuṉ kāraṇattāl tiṉṉā tārkku vataittuoṉṟai iṭāmaiyiṉāl vataittavarkkē pāvam
eṉṉiluṉai ūṭṭiṉarkkup pāvañ cēra eṉṉatavam purikiṉṟāy pulālkaṭavuṭku iṭāyō
uṉuṭalam acuciyeṉa nāṇi vēṟōr uṭaluṇṇīṉ acuciyeṉa uṇarntilaikāṇ nīyē.

[The Sautrāntika Buddhist holds that eating the flesh of an animal is not sinful and only killing it is sinful. The Śaiva Siddhāntin responds that if there are no meat-eaters, then there will be no butchers. No one will try to offer meat to the vegetarians. Sarcastically, the Siddhāntin asks the Buddhist what forms [kinds] of prayers he offers to those butchers who feed him. It is loathsome that the Buddhist should proffer meat to his deities and shamelessly eat the flesh of lower forms of life despite considering their own bodies as impure].

TRANSLATION:

Bauddha! (*Puttā*) If you say that it is not wrong [sinful] to eat [the flesh of] (*kuṟram ilai tiṉṉum atu eṉum*) dead [animals] (*cettatu*), knowing that you eat [meat] (*tiṉpaiyeṉa*) that they slaughtered and fed you (*koṉṟu uṉakkut tīṟriṉarkku*), [know that] because of you (*uṉ kāraṇattāl*) they abound in sin (*maṉṉuvatu pāvam*). No one would kill a life (*oṉṟai vataittu*) and offer it (*iṭāmaiyiṉāl*) to those who do not eat [meat] (*tiṉṉā tārkku*). If you say that the sins belong to the killers [butchers] (*vataittavarkkē pāvam eṉṉil*), what austerities are you undertaking (*eṉṉa tavam purikiṉṟāy*) to accumulate sins (*pāvañ cēra*) to those who feed you (*uṉai ūṭṭiṉarkku*)?[437] Do you offer meat (*pulāl iṭāyō*) to [your] god (*kaṭavuṭku*)? Being disgusted with your own body (*uṉ uṭalam nāṇi*) as unclean (*acuciyeṉa*), do you

[437] Obvious sarcasm.

not see (*kāṇ nīyē*) that you eat [the meat of] other bodies (*vēṟōr uṭal uṇṇīṉ*) not realizing that they are impure (*acuciyeṉa uṇarntilai*)?

VERSE 132

kuṭainiḻalum kaṇṇāṭic cāyaiyumpōl piṟappuk koḷḷumuṇarvu eṉṉiṟkā
raṇamaḻiya aḻiyum
aṭainiḻalpōl kantamaintum aḻiyum uṉakku iṅkē avaiyaḻintāl
aruṅkatiyiṉ aṇaiyum uṇarvu iṉṟām
iṭaikaṉaviṉ eḻum uṇarvu naṉavuṇarvu āṉāṟpōl eḻum uṇarvu
kaṉmattāl niṉaintakati eṉṉiṉ
miṭaiciṉaiyum antaṉummuṭṭaiyum uyirviṭṭakkāl mēvuvatueṉ
piṟappiṉuṭal viṭātukaṉma uṇarvē.

[The Sautrāntika Buddhist holds that just as the shadow of an umbrella resembles the umbrella and just as the reflection of an object seen in the mirror resembles the object, at the demise of this body another body will emerge. The Śaiva Siddhāntin responds that if a cause is removed, its effect will also be removed. Without an umbrella there will be no shadow and without a mirror there will be no image. If the five aggregates of the body are removed, then there will be no consciousness left to attain salvation. If it is claimed that consciousness is regained from the karmic remnants just as consciousness is regained after dream or sleep state, then it is similar to suggesting that a blind man will attain salvation after losing his sight. It is ascertained that the soul never leaves the body].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that consciousness is born (*piṟappuk koḷḷum uṇarvu eṉṉiṟ*) similar to the shadow [or shade] of an umbrella (*kuṭai niḻalum*) or the reflection in a mirror (*kaṇṇāṭic cāyaiyumpōl*), then it will be destroyed (*aḻiya*) when the cause is destroyed (*kāraṇam aḻiyum*). As the shadow (*aṭainiḻalpōl*), the five aggregates are destroyed (*kantamaintum aḻiyum*) here [in this world] (*iṅkē*). If they are destroyed

(*avaiyaḻintāl*), there will be no consciousness (*uṇarvu iṉṟām*) to reach the heaven (*aruṅkatiyiṉ aṇaiyum*). You say that it is similar to a dream (*iṭaikaṉaviṉ eṉṉiṉ*), knowledge appearing (*eḻum uṇarvu āṉāṟpōl*) as the waking consciousness (*naṉavuṇarvu*), and it is the consciousness caused by (*uṇarvu eḻum*) the karmic memory (*kaṉmattāl niṉaintakati*). [Then,] what will happen (*mēvuvatueṉ*) to the roes (*miṭaiciṉaiyum*), the blind man (*antaṉum*), and the egg (*muṭṭaiyum*) when they lose their lives (*uyirviṭṭakkāl*)? The karmic consciousness (*kaṉma uṇarvē*) will never leave the body born at birth (*piṟappiṉ uṭal viṭātu*).

VERSE 133

aintukantam cantāṉattu aḻitalpanta tukkam aṟakkeṭukai muttiyiṉpam
eṉṟaṟaintāy kantam
aintumaḻin tālmutti aṇaipavaryār eṉṉa aṇaipavarvēṟu illaieṉṟāy
ārkkumutti iṉpam
aintiṉuṇar viṉukkeṉṉil aḻiyāta av uṇarvu uṇṭu ākavē evviṭattum
uruvāti kantam
aintumuḻa vām atuvum panta māki arantaitaru muttiyiṉpam
aṟintilaikāṇ nīyē.

[The Sautrāntika Buddhist considers that when the five aggregates are destroyed the ecstasy of the final release or salvation can be experienced, but the Buddhist cannot explain “who” is that who experiences the bliss. If that is the case, the Śaiva Siddhāntin declares that if the consciousness born of the five aggregates is the “experiencer” of the bliss, then it can never perish. The Buddhist is not knowledgeable about the final release or nirvāṇa!].

TRANSLATION:

You stated that the five aggregates appear in succession (*aintukantam cantāṉattu aṟaintāy*), and are destroyed [in succession] (*aḻital*) causing bondage and affliction (*panta tukkam*). The destruction of these (*aṟakkeṭukai*) creates the ecstasy (*iṉpam*) of release (*mutti*). When asked as to who attains (*yār aṇaipavar*

eṉṉa) liberation (*mutti*) if the five aggregates are destroyed (*kantam aintum aḻintāl*), you replied that no one attains [liberation] (*vēṟu illai aṇaipavar eṉṟāy*). [If so] who [experiences] (*ārkku*) the ecstasy (*iṉpam*) of the [final] liberation (*mutti*)? If you reply that [it is the resulting] consciousness (*uṇarviṉukk eṉṉil*) [from the union of] the five [aggregates] (*aintiṉ*), then [it means] consciousness (*av uṇarvu*) was never destroyed (*aḻiyātu*). Therefore, it will never leave the body (*evviṭattum uruvāti ākavē*) and will evolve into five aggregates (*aintumuḻa vām kantam*) causing bondage and distress (*panta māki arantaitaru*). Realize that you do not have [clear] knowledge (*nīyē aṟintilai kāṇ*) about the ecstasy [associated with the] final liberation (*mutti iṉpam*).

VERSE 134

anātimutta ṉāyppaṟaṉāy acalaṉāy ellā aṟivutoḻil aṉukkirakkam
uṭaiya araṉ kaṉmam
nuṉātikam aṟṟu ottaviṭat tēcatti nipātam nuḻaivittu malaṅkaḷelām
nuṅka nōkki
maṉātikara ṇaṅkaḷelām aṭakkit taṉṉai vaḻipaṭutal aṟivuaruḷi
mākkaruṇaik kaiyāl
iṉātapiṟap piṉilniṉṟum eṭuttu māṟā iṉpamuttik kēvaippaṉ eṅkaḷ mutti
ituvē.

[In concluding his arguments opposing the Buddhist Sautrāntika school, the Śaiva Siddhāntin reiterates the graceful and compassionate nature of Śiva, who guides his followers in nullifying their impurities and shows them the path of wisdom. According to the Śaiva Siddhāntin, such is the path for the final release or salvation].

TRANSLATION:

He is the eternal (*anāti*); he is free from impurities (*muttaṉ*); he is the Supreme Being (*paraṉāy*); he is motionless (*acalaṉ*); he is the graceful (*aṉukkirakkam uṭaiya*); he is the [embodiment of] knowledge (*aṟivu*) and [capable of] all tasks

(*to̲lil*); and he is Śiva (*ara̲n̲*). He shows the path of wisdom (*a̲rivu aruḷi*) to worship him (*ta̲n̲n̲ai va̲lipaṭutal*) and with his great compassionate hands (*mākkaruṇaik kaiyāl*) saves us from repeated births (*iṉāta pi̲rappiṉiln i̲n̲rum eṭuttu*), thus providing eternal bliss in salvation (*mā̲rā iṉpa muttikkē vaippa̲n̲*). He helps us to get rid of (*otta viṭattē*) the remnant karma (*kaṉmam nuṉātikam a̲rru*), introduces us to the right path (*catti nipātam*[438] *nu̲laivittu*), destroys all impurities (*malaṅkaḷelām nuṅka*), and helps us in controlling (*aṭakki*) our mind and senses (*ma̲n̲ātikara ṇaṅkaḷelām*). This (*ituvē*) is our concept of liberation (*eṅkaḷ mutti*).

4.3A YŌGĀCĀRA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSE 135)

VERSE 135

pōtamē poruḷāyt tō̲n̲rum poruḷatāy e̲lalāl pōtam
vātaṉai ataṉāl kūṭi varutalāl vaṭivi lāmai
ātalāl kaṉavē pōlum cakam uḷatu a̲rivē yāme̲n̲ru
ōtiṉā̲n̲ ōtāṉāya uṇarviṉāl yōkā cāraṉ̲.

[This is a single verse establishing the protagonist position of the Buddhist Yōgācāra school. With great skill and brevity, Aruṇanti has summarized the entire philosophy of the Yōgācāra school and offers his counter position in the following two verses. The school considers the world to be a dream and consciousness is the only reality that evolves as senses and forms of perception. The Śaiva Siddhāntin declares that as the Buddhist is not well versed, he claims that consciousness/intelligence evolves as everything].

TRANSLATION:

[According to the Yogacārin], knowledge [consciousness] evolves as the senses (*pōtamē poruḷāyt tō̲n̲rum*) and the forms of perception (*poruḷatāy e̲lalāl pōtam*). Formless intelligence (*vaṭivilāmai vātaṉai*) emerges in association with sense

[438] *Catti-nipātam*: Settling of the divine grace in the soul when it is ripe. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "Catti-nipātam" (p. 1250)*.

experience (*ataṉāl kūṭi varutalāl*). Therefore, (*ātalāl*), the world (*cakam*) is similar to a dream (*kaṉavē pōlum*). Because the Yogacārin (*yōkācāraṉ*) is not well versed [in the scriptures] (*ōtāṉāya uṇarviṉāl*), he states that (*eṉṟu ōtiṉāṉ*) the intelligence evolves as everything [senses and perception] (*uḷatu aṟivē yām*).

4.3B YŌGĀCĀRA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 136-137)

VERSE 136

pōtamum tavira vēṟuōr vātaṉai pukaṉṟāy pōtam
vātaṉai iraṇṭu uṇṭu eṉṉāy pōtamvā taṉaiyum eṉṉil
kātalāl poruḷi ṉōṭu kalantupiṉ eḻumka ruttām
vātaṉai kaṉavu kaṇṭa poruḷiṉmēl varum karuttē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin starts his rebuttal by saying that the Yōgācārin Buddhist recognizes consciousness and remnant impressions from previous births but does not provide any distinction between them. If they are identical, their experiences will be the same. It cannot be so, because when the consciousness gets united with the objects, the remnant impressions will make the consciousness drawn towards the objects again and again. This implies that the consciousness and the remnant impressions are different from each other. Furthermore, as the dreams contain objects encountered in waking life, the world cannot be a dream].

TRANSLATION:

You declared (*pukaṉṟāy*) that besides intelligence (*vēṟuōr tavira pōtamum*), there are impressions [from previous birth] (*vātaṉai*)[439]. You did not say (*eṉṉāy*)[440] that

[439] The poet appears to be using the word *vātaṉai* in the sense of *vācaṉai* or impressions. ("Predisposition in the present life due to the experiences of a former birth" - *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "vātaṉai" (p. 3578)*.

[440] Use of the word *eṉṉāy* is ambiguous. In this context it is translated as "you did not say" MUTALIAR 1910:204.

intelligence (*pōtam*) and impressions (*vātaṉai*) are two different [things] (*iraṇṭu uṇṭu*). If intelligence (*pōtam*) is the same as (*eṉṉil*) impressions (*vātaṉaiyum*), then when [intelligence] is united (*kalantupiṉ*) with the objects (*poruḷiṉōṭu*) due to desire (*kātalāl*), impressions (*vātaṉai*) will be the agents (*karuttām*) for this drive (*eḷum*). In a similar way (*varum karuttē*), objects (*poruḷiṉmēl*) seen (*kaṇṭa*) in a dream (*kaṉavu*) [are from real life impressions].

VERSE 137

aṟivatē poruḷatu ākil akamcaṭam eṉṉa vēṇṭum
piṟiporuḷ ākum pētittu itampira pañcam eṉṉil
uṟuporuḷ uruvam tōyntāl uṇarvum avvuruvāy niṟkum
ceṟiporuḷ atuvāy niṟkum teḷipaḷiṅku atuvē pōla.

[In the concluding verse of his rebuttal to the Yōgācāra school, Aruṇanti states that if consciousness and matter are the same reality, then one can claim, “I am the body.” On the other hand, if consciousness and matter are different, one can claim, “I am matter.” If consciousness and matter are united, then they will appear coalesced as one, just as a crystal will take upon itself the color of the object reflected in it].

TRANSLATION:

If intelligence is the only matter [in the phenomenal world] (*aṟivatē poruḷatu ākil*), then I can say that (*eṉṉa vēṇṭum*) I am the body (*akam caṭam*). If the two [intelligence and the body] are different (*piṟiporuḷ ākum*), and if my intelligence is unrelated to matter (*pētittu*), then I can say, “I am matter” (*itam pirapañcam eṉṉil*). If intelligence (*uṟuporuḷ*) is united with a form (*tōyntāl uruvam*), then intelligence will appear as that form (*uṇarvum niṟkum avvuruvāy*) just as (*atuvē pōla*) a crystal (*teḷipaḷiṅku*) assumes the color of the object it reflects (*ceṟiporuḷ atuvāy niṟkum*).

4.4A MĀDHYAMIKA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSE 138)

VERSE 138

avayavam poruḷāyt tōn̲r̲um avayavam a̲lintāl piṉṉai
ivaiporuḷ eṉṉa vēr̲uon̲r̲u ilāmaiyāl poruḷkaḷ in̲r̲ām
avaiporuḷ ilāmai yālē a̲r̲ivumiṉ r̲ākum en̲r̲u
navaitaru mo̲liyi ṉālē navilummāt tiyami kantān̲.

[Here, too, Śaiva Siddhāntin presents the position of the Mādhyamika school in one verse and offers his rebuttal in two verses. The school holds that the body is simply an aggregate of the senses. When the senses perish, nothing is left behind, and hence there is no intelligence[441] without the body].

TRANSLATION:

The sense organs [and sense perceptions] (*avayavam*) appear (*tōn̲r̲um*) as the body (*poruḷāy*). When these sense organs (*avayavam*) perish (*a̲lintāl*), nothing else (*vēr̲uon̲r̲u*) is left behind (*piṉṉai ilāmaiyāl in̲r̲ām*) that can be identified as a body (*ivaiporuḷ eṉṉa*). If there is no matter [body] (*avaiporuḷ ilāmai yālē*), there cannot be any intelligence [without the body] (*a̲r̲ivum in̲r̲ākum*). Thus says (*en̲r̲u navilum*) the Mādhyamika (*māttiyamikantān̲*) in a faulty (*navaitaru*) language [position] (*mo̲liyi ṉālē*).

4.4B MĀDHYAMIKA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 139-140)

VERSE 139

kaṭattiṉil avaya vaṅkaḷ paṭattiṉil pukāmal kāttum
paṭattiṉil avaya vaṅkaḷ kaṭattiṉil pukāmal koṇṭum
iṭattiṉil ni̲r̲kum ākum avayavi iraṇṭum kūṭi

---

[441] It is worth noting that in certain schools of Indian philosophy, such as Sāṁkhya, intelligence (*buddhi*) is the first evolute of primal matter (*prakṛti*), is the faculty of discrimination and judgment, and is the basis of all intellectual and psychological activity in the individual. See JOHNSON 2009:72.

uṭaittu oru poruḷ uṇṭākap poruḷum uṇṭu uṇarvum uṇṭē.

[The Mādhyamika **BUDDHIST** considers that only the characteristics or attributes constitute the body and not matter. Aruṇanti points out that the characteristics of a pot are not seen in a cloth and the characteristics of a cloth cannot be seen in a pot. Both characteristics and matter should unite and coalesce together to form an object. Similarly, the body and the soul or consciousness is formed as substance and its characteristics].

TRANSLATION:

The characteristics (*avayavaṅkaḷ*) of a pot (*kaṭattiṉil*) are not seen (*pukāmal*) in a cloth (*paṭattiṉil*) and the characteristics (*avayavaṅkaḷ*) of a cloth (*paṭattiṉil*) are not seen (*pukāmal*) in a pot (*kaṭattiṉil*). Because both (*iraṇṭum*) the characteristics (*avayavi*) and matter are separate (*iṭattiṉil niṟkum*), when they combine (*kūṭi*) and merge (*uṭaittu*), an object (*oru poruḷ*) is created (*uṇṭākap*). Both body (*poruḷum*) and consciousness [soul] (*uṇarvum*) exist (*uṇṭu*).

VERSE 140

karuviyum oḻiyum vēṟu karutiṭum karuttum niṟkap
poruḷ puṇa rāmai yālē pōtamvantu eḻuvatu iṉṟām
maruviṭum poruḷuṇ ṭāka vantueḻum punti āṉāl
poruḷuḷatu ākum ākap pōtamum uḷḷa tāmē.

[In the concluding verse directed to the Mādhyamika school, the poet stresses that the soul is an essential element in making cognition feasible. It has to unite itself with the senses and the objects. Both the soul and its intelligence are real].

TRANSLATION:

Although the sense organs (*karuviyum*) and their sense perceptions (*karutiṭum karuttum*) have different nature (*oḻiyum*) and are apart [from the soul] (*vēṟu niṟka*), they cannot (*iṉṟām*) generate (*vantu eḻuvatu*) knowledge (*pōtam*) unless they

unite (*puṇarāmai*) with the soul (*poruḷ yālē*).[442] When they unite (*vantueḻum*), only the soul has the knowledge (*punti*) to perceive (*maruviṭum*) an object (*poruḷ uṇṭāka*). [Know that] the soul (*poruḷ*) is real (*uḷatu ākum*) and [furthermore] it also has (*uḷḷa tame*) intelligence (*pōtamum*).

4.5A VAIBHĀṢIKA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSE 141)

VERSE 141

aricaṉam nūṟu kūṭa aruṇamvantu eḻuntāl pōla
viricakam poruḷkaḷ ñāṉam viraviṭa mēvit tōṉṟum
tericaṉam ituvē eṉṟu teḷintuṭum tērar vīṭu
parivoṭum aṭaivīr eṉṟu pakarumvai pāṭi kaṉtāṉ.

[Aruṇanti gives his protagonist account of the last Buddhist school, the Vaibhāṣikas. In one verse, the school's position is summarized and the refutation is also enunciated in one verse. The school holds that when consciousness and the perception of an object combine, cognition will take place just as a red color results when turmeric is mixed with lime. The Buddhist asserts that if one is aware of this doctrine, then the Buddha's abode can be reached].

TRANSLATION:

Just as red color results (*vantu eḻuntāl aruṇam pōla*) when turmeric (*aricaṉam*) is mixed with lime (*nūṟu kūṭa*), worldly objects (*viricakam poruḷkaḷ*) become apparent (*mēvit tōṉṟum*) when the knowledge [of the senses] and the objects combine (*ñāṉam viraviṭa*). It is clear (*teḷintuṭum*) that this is (*ituvē eṉṟu*) our religious doctrine (*tericaṉam*). [If you realize this,] you will reach (*aṭaivīr*) Buddha's abode (*tērar vīṭu*)[443], thus says (*eṉṟu pakarum*) the Vaibhāṣika

[442] In this verse, the Tamil word *poruḷ* refers to the soul as well as an object, *oḷi* refers to quality and *karutiṭum karuttum* refers to the sense perceptions. See MUTTAPPAN 1987:105.

[443] The introduction of the word *tērar* (Buddhist Bhikṣu) suggests that the poet means Buddha's abode because *vīṭu* means a house as well as liberation or heaven. This also makes the word *parivoṭum* more apt.

(*vaipāṭikaṉṭāṉ*) with devotion (*parivoṭum*).

4.5B VAIBHĀṢIKA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSE 142)

VERSE 142

poruḷatu puṟampatu ākum pōtaman taramatu ākum
teruḷiṭiṉ iraṇṭum ceṉṟu cērntiṭum āṟatu iṉṟām
aruvuuṇarvu uruvam ñēyam ātali ṉālum kūṭā
uruaru uṭaiya vaipā ṭikaṟkuiṉi māṟṟam iṉṟē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin school points out the fallacy of the Vaibhāṣika school's claim. As the objects to be perceived are external while the knowledge gained is internal, they cannot combine to facilitate cognition. Besides, knowledge is without form, while the objects perceived have forms. Hence, the school's claim is negated].

TRANSLATION:

Objects [to be known] are external (*poruḷatu puṟampatu ākum*) and the knowledge [known] (*pōtam*) is internal (*antaram atu ākum*). The two (*iraṇṭum*) cannot combine (*ceṉṟu cērntiṭum iṉṟām*) to gather clear intelligence (*teruḷiṭiṉ*). [Furthermore], knowledge (*uṇarvu*) is formless (*aruvu*) and the known (*ñēyam*) has forms (*uruvam*). Therefore (*ātaliṉālum*), they cannot unite (*kūṭā*). There is no further (*iṉi iṉṟē*) rejoinder (*māṟṟam*) to the Vaibhāṣika (*vaipāṭikaṟku*), who holds (*uṭaiya*) that, the form (*uru*) and the formless (*aru*) [can unite].

4.6A NIGAṆḌAVĀDA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 143-150)

VERSE 143

vāca māmalar acōku pēṇimaṟai nīti yōṭumalai yumtavattu
ācai yāluṭai akaṉṟu māciṉai aṭaintuil vāḻtarum aṟattiṉil
pāca māṉatu tavirntu paṇṭipaṭa uṇṭu pāyiṉoṭu pīlimēl
nēca māyavai tarittu ḷōrkaḷil nikaṇṭa vātiyai nikaḻttuvām.

[Jainism is one of the oldest religions in India, which is still very much alive even today, and it is as old, if not older than Buddhism. The two main sub-schools of Jainism are Śvetāmbara (wearers of white clothes) and Digambaras (the naked),[444] Only the Digambara school gained popularity in the Tamil country. This school is further divided into Niggaṇṭhas[445] (those who have no bonds), and Ājīvikas (probably implying that they took lifelong or *ājīvat* vows).[446] As a protagonist Aruṇanti focuses on Nigaṇḍavādin, outlines their principles in eight verses and as an antagonist refutes their position in eighteen verses. Despite the fact that he is supposedly presenting the Nigaṇḍavādins position from the Nigaṇḍavādins own perspective, Aruṇanti has a very unflattering harsh introduction. "Worshipping a tree as a god, contrary to what the four Vedas advocate, they discard their clothes and go around naked and dirty. They take on asceticism, cover their bodies with a mat, and eat as gluttons. In a friendly manner, we will examine their doctrinal positions"].

TRANSLATION:

With great care, [they worship] the Aśoka trees (*acōku pēṇi*), which have fragrant bee-covered flowers (*vāca māmalar*). Due to the desire to follow austerities (*tavattu ācai yāl*), which are inconsistent with (*malaiyum*) Vedic prescriptions (*maṟai nīti yōṭu*), they discard clothes (*uṭai akaṉṟu*), and they are dirty [due to lack of proper hygiene] (*māciṉai aṭaintu*). They abandon (*aṟattiṉil*) the life of a householder (*il vāḻtarum*) due to lack of desire (*pāca māṇatu tavirntu*), eat in a gluttonous manner (*paṇṭipaṭa uṇṭu*), and [cover the body] with a mat (*pāyiṉoṭu*), and [carry] a peacock-feather [fan] (*pīlimēl*). In a friendly fashion (*nēcamāy*), we will explain (*nikaḻttuvām*) the Nigaṇḍavādin [school] (*nikaṇṭa vātiyai*), which abides by these [practices] (*avai tarittuḷōrkaḷil*).

---

[444] Cuvētāmpara and Tikampara in Tamil.
[445] They are referred to as Niganḍavādins in Sanskrit.
[446] Nikaṇṭavāti and Ācīvakaṉ in Tamil.

VERSE 144

īṟi lātaṉa ananta ñāṉamutal eṇku ṇaṅkaḷ eṉum oṇkuṇam
māṟi lātamati mēvu cītameṉa maṉṉi vāṉavar vaṇaṅkavē
vēṟu lāvukuṇa ñāṉa āvaraṇi āti eṭṭiṉaiyum viṭṭacīr
ēṟu pāṉmaiyuṭai nīṭu vāḻarukaṉ eṅka ḷukkuiṟaivaṉ eṉṟaṉaṉ.

["Just as the brilliant full moon, our Arukaṉ[447] is the faultless master of the limitless knowledge of eight virtues. He, who also vanquished the eight evil qualities, is worshipped by the celestials"].

TRANSLATION:

Immortal Arukaṉ (*nīṭu vāḻ arukaṉ*), famous for his excellence (*ēṟu pāṉmaiyuṭai*), is our god (*eṅkaḷukku iṟaivaṉ*). He has mastered (*maṉṉi*) the blemishless "limitless knowledge" (*īṟi ilātaṉa ananta ñāṉamutal*)[448] and eight other qualities (*eṇ kuṇaṅkaḷ*). He shines as an eternal (*kuṇam māṟilāta*), brilliant (full moon) (*oṇ mati*), clothed in coolness (*cītameṉa*). Worshipped by (*vaṇaṅkavē*) the celestial beings (*vāṉavar*), he has the reputation for having destroyed (*cīr viṭṭa*) the eight (*eṭṭiṉaiyum*) evil qualities (*vēṟu lāvu kuṇa*) such as "defective knowledge" (*ñāṉa āvaraṇi*)[449] and others (*āti*).

VERSE 145

---

[447] Arukatēvaṉ (arukaṉ) is the Jaina Arhat Varttamāṉa tīrttaṅkara. Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "Makāvīraṉ" (p. 2992). In Sanskrit, Arhat literally means "the worthy one." See KEOWN 2004:18. "Arhat is a common word used in pre-Buddhistic times for anyone who attains the ideal of his religion." See RADHAKRISHNAN 1989:428.

[448] The eight laudable qualities are: 1. Limitless knowledge (*aṉanta ñāṉam*) 2. Limitless sight (*aṉanta taricaṉam*) 3. Limitless virility (*aṉanta vīriyam*) 4. Limitless enjoyment (*aṉanta cukam*) 5. Namelessness (*nirnāmam*) 6. No lineage (*nirkōttiram*) 7. Eternal (*nir āyuḷyam*) and 8. Indestructible (*cammitā pāvam*) MUTTAPPAN 2003:108.

[449] The eight malevolent qualities are: 1. Defective knowledge (*ñāṉāvaraṇīyam*) 2. Defective sight (*taricaṉāvaraṇīyam*) 3. Diminished virility (*vētaṇīyam*) 4. Lust (*mōkaṇīyam*) 5. Adherence to a name (*āyuṭiya nāmam*) 6. Adherence to lineage (*kōttira nāmam*) 7. Part of birth and death cycle (*āyavantarāyam*) and 8. Prone to destruction (*kāyavantirāyam*) MUTTAPPAN 2003:108.

karuvi kaṇpaṭu toṭakku oḻintuvaru kālam mūṉṟilnikaḻ kāriyam
peruka niṉṟuoru kaṇatti lēyuṇar perum tavakkaṭavuḻ pīṭiṉāl
maruvi niṉṟuvaḻi paṭṭa varkkum malaivu uṟṟa varkkummaṉam
ottiṭum
kurucil eṅkaḻ iṟai eṉṟu piṉṉumnikaḻ kuṟṟam iṉmaiyatu kūṟuvāṉ.

["Our Arukaṉ is beyond the influences of the senses and he is cognizant of all events taking place everywhere during all three periods of time—past, present, and future. He bestows his grace on those who worship him as well as those who do not worship him. Such is his greatness and the protagonist") will articulate more.

TRANSLATION:

Our majestic god (*perum*), who personifies austerities (*tavakkaṭavuḻ*), has rid himself of the entanglement (*toṭakku oḻintu*) and the evil influences of the senses (*kaṇpaṭu karuvi*). From ancient times (*peruka niṉṟu*), he can envision instantly (*oru kaṇattilē yuṇar*) the events taking place (*nikaḻ kāriyam*) in three periods of time [the past, the present, and the future] (*varukālam mūṉṟil*). Our benefactor (*kurucil*), with his greatness [will bless] with equanimity (*pīṭiṉāl maṉam ottiṭum*) those who have adopted him (*maruvi niṉṟu*) and follow him (*vaḻi paṭṭa varkkum*) [as well as] those who do not follow him (*malaivu uṟṟa varkkum*). Calling him his god (*eṅkaḻ iṟai eṉṟu*) with a faultless nature (*kuṟṟam iṉmaiyatu*), he [the advocate] will articulate (*nikaḻ kūṟuvāṉ*) more later (*piṉṉum*).

VERSE 146

pacittal tākampayam ceṟṟa mōṭuuvakai mōka cintaṉai paḻittal nōy
nacittal vērviṉoṭu kēta mōṭumatam vēṇṭal īṇṭuati cayittalum
pucippu vantiṭu piṟappu uṟakkamivai viṭṭor aṭṭakuṇa pūtaṉāy
vacitta vaṉulakiṉ mēliruntu orucol ikalaṉukku aruḷum eṉṟaṉaṉ.

["He is beyond the bodily needs of hunger, thirst, fear, rancor, and a litany of

other human needs and frailties. The virtuous one lives above this world and graced his worshippers by teaching them a single (powerful) word"].

TRANSLATION:

He has eliminated [and he is beyond] (*ivai viṭṭu*) hunger (*pacittal*), thirst (*tākam*), fear (*payam*), rancor (*ceṟṟam*), desire (*uvakai*), lust (*mōkam*), contemplation (*cintaṉai*), slander (*paḻittal*), sickness (*nōy*), death (*nacittal*), perspiration (*vērviṉoṭu*), anguish (*kētam*), desirous of pride (*matam vēṇṭal*), being surprised (*īṇṭu atucayittalum*), food (*pucippu*), birth (*vantiṭu piṟappu*), and sleep (*uṟakkam*). He is endowed with (*pūtaṉāy*) eight great traits (*aṭṭakuṇa*). He lives (*vacittavaṉ*) above (*mēl iruntu*) this world (*ulakiṉ*). He graced (*aruḷum*) his follower(s) (*ikalaṉ*)[450] with a teaching of [a single word] "one word" (*orucol*).

VERSE 147

anta vāymoḻiyi ṉāl avaṉcaraṇam āti yōkamutal āṉa nūl
inta mānilam mayaṅki ṭātavakai iṅku iyampiṉaṉ itaṉporuḷ
vanta kālamuyir taṉma taṉmiaṟam maṟṟum viṇmaruvu puṟkalam
pantam vīṭṭiṉōṭu anāti yāyivai paṭaippatu iṉṟiuḷa pattumē.

["From that one powerful word he (Arukaṉ) composed the treatises. The ten eternal principles are outlined in these treatises"].

TRANSLATION:

Using that one word (*anta vāy moḻiyiṉāl*), he [Arukaṉ] composed (*avaṉ iṅku iyampiṉaṉ*) many principal treatises (*mutal āṉa nūl*) such as (*āti*), "surrender" (*caraṇam*), and "yoga" (*yōkam*) to [save] this world (*inta mānilam*) from delusions (*mayaṅki ṭātavakai*). The meaning of [these books] (*itaṉ poruḷ*) is that the evolving time (*vanta kālam*), life (*uyir*), righteousness (*taṉma*), non-righteousness

[450] The Tamil word *ikalaṉ* means a "warrior." *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "ikalaṉ" (p. 268)*. Here it is translated as a "follower."

(*taṉmi*) virtue (*aṟam*), other [non-virtue] (*maṟṟum*), fundamental entities [atomic bodies] (*viṇmaruvu*), matter as non-living part of creation [*pudgala*] (*puṟkalam*), bondage (*pantam*), and release [heaven] (*vīṭṭiṉōṭu*) are the ten (*pattumē*) eternal [entities] (*anātiyāy*) which are not created [by any] (*paṭaippatu iṉṟi*).

VERSE 148

niṟṟa lōṭutalai pōtal aṉṉuvayam nikaḻttu nīṭu eti rēkamum
uṟṟa tāmivai kaṇatti lēmaruvi uḷḷa vāpuriyu māṟutāṉ
kaṟṟa kālamaḷavu eyti vāḻumuyir kāya mēviniṟaivu āṉatē
peṟṟu vēṟuvaru taṉmai nēraṟivu peṟṟa tākiyuḷa pēcilē.

[The soul resides in the body that is affected by the three periods of time (past, present, and future), and undergoes changes from infancy to youth and then to old age, exhibiting appropriate intelligence with growth and decay of the body].

TRANSLATION:

Time continues in succession (*nikaḻttu nīṭu aṉṉuvayam*) from what is destroyed in the past (*talai pōtal*) to the present (*niṟṟa lōṭu*) and to the future (*etirēkamum*). Time is what results (*kālam kaṟṟa*) when all these [three] combine (*ivai maruvi*) at the same moment (*kaṇattilē*) and evolve (*māṟutāṉ*). The life [soul] (*uyir*), limited by time (*aḷavu eyti*), lives in the body (*kāyam vāḻum*), permeates it (*niṟaivu āṉatē*), and undergoes changes [from infancy to old age] (*vēṟuvaru taṉmai peṟṟu*), and it becomes (*āki uḷa*) the intelligence (*nēraṟivu peṟṟa*).

VERSE 149

parantu mītutaru mātti kāyam aḻi vitta nittamatu paṇṇiṭum
nirantu kīḻataru mātti kāyamatu nitta māymika niṟuttiṭum
puranta puṇṇiyam itaṟku naṉmaipukal pāvam āṉaatu tīmaiyē
tarumpō ruṭkuiṭamatu ākum vāṉamiku puṟka laṉkaḷ avai cāṟṟuvām.

["Leading a virtuous life will result in a superior body that can obtain eternal

liberation, while leading an evil life of vices will keep the body in an eternal bondage. The vast space of creation accommodates innumerable objects of varying characteristics"].

TRANSLATION:

The superior body (*parantu mītu*) resulting from the virtues (*tarumāttikāyam*)[451] enables [the soul] (*atu paṇṇiṭum*) to attain eternal liberation (*aḻivitta nittam*). [On the contrary], the inferior (*nirantu kīḻ*) body resulting from vices (*arumāttikāyam*) will keep the soul eternally in bondage (*nittamāy niṟuttiṭum*). The merits gained by virtuous deeds (*puṇṇiyam puranta*) benefit in getting this [superior body] (*naṉmai itaṟku*)]. Evil acts will result (*tīmaiyē āṉaatu tarum*) in the accumulation of sins (*pāvam*). It is proclaimed (*cāṟṟuvām*) that space offers room (*vāṉam iṭamatu ākum*) for all objects (*poruṭku*), including all matter [*pudgala*s] (*puṟkalaṉkaḻ avai*).

VERSE 150

ēṇum oṉṟuṭaiya vāki eṅkumaṇu vāy irumpukal maraṅkaḻum
pūṇum aṅkuuru elāmum ākumivai puṟka lapporuḻkaḻ eṉṉalām
kāṇum aṅkuaṟu vakaittō ḻilkaḻavai kaṭṭu viṭṭaneṟi kaṉmammēl
māṇa niṉṟuvarum māṟi māṟimuṉ vakaintatu uṇṭuviṭa māṭciyē.

[Aruṇanti provides a definition for the term *pudgala* in Sanskrit (*puṟkalam* in Tamil). It represents inanimate matter such as stone, iron, and trees. It undergoes six kinds of perpetual activities that are malicious in nature causing bondage. If we keep ourselves free from the clutches of these activities, and engage ourselves in austerities, we will experience good births. Repeated good births will enable us to enjoy the fruits of our virtues and attain liberation. This ends the arguments of the Niganḍavādins].

TRANSLATION:

---

[451] *Tarmāstikāyam* and *atarmāstikāyam* are Jaina technical words that denote "the body taken due to virtues" and "the body taken due to vices", respectively PIḺḺAI 1975:72.

Everywhere, with great strength (*eṅkum ēṇum*), they assume forms such as (*oṉṟuṭaiya vāki*) an atom (*aṇuvāy*), iron (*irumpu*), stone (*kal*), trees (*maraṅkaḷum*), and attach themselves (*pūṇum*) to become (*ākum ivai*) different types of forms (*uru elāmum*). We may call (*eṉṉalām*) these as objects of matter (*poruḷkaḷ puṟkala*). There [in the world], they are bound (*aṅku avai kaṭṭu*) by six types of (*aṟu vakai*) perceptual activities (*kāṇum tōḻilkaḷ*).[452] Observing righteousness (*neṟi kaṉmam*) is the abandonment [of that attachment] (*viṭṭa*). Then, greatness [good births] (*mēl māṇa*) will be sustained [by that righteousness] (*niṉṟu varum*). In the repeated births (*māṟi māṟi*) we undergo, we enjoy the [fruits of karma] (*uṇṭuviṭa*) which are in store for us (*muṉ vakaintatu*), [and when they are exhausted, we attain] liberation (*māṭciyē*).

4.6B NIGAṆḌAVĀDA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 151-164)

VERSE 151

aruka ṉukku aṉantañāṉam āti yāti yākavē
peruka niṟṟal cītamā matikku aṭainta peṟṟiyēl
oruvum iṭṭa oppuvaṉ uyirt tiṟattiṉ uḷḷapiṉ
maruvu mikka kuṟṟamēl aṟattiṉ maṉṉi ṉāṉeṉil.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his arguments against the Nigaṇḍavādin. “When you described your Arukaṉ, you alluded to his limitless knowledge and his eight noble qualities and compared him to the coolness of the moon. From your metaphor, it suggests that his nobility could wax and wane similar to the moon; it means that he is not any different from a normal human being. If you refuse that and say only his noble qualities undergo change…” (continues in the next verse)].

TRANSLATION:

---

[452] The six activities are smell (*maṇam*), taste (*cuvai*), sight (*uruvam*), sense of touch (*ūṟu*), sound (*ōcai*), and transformation (*pariṇāmam*).

[Then] Arukaṉ has limitless knowledge (*arukaṉukku aṉanta ñāṉam*) and other such attributes (*āti yāti yākavē*) [etc., etc.] comparing him to the coolness of the full moon (*cītamā matikku aṭainta*). If that is so (*perriyēl*), the comparison is not acceptable (*oruvum iṭṭa oppu*).[453] The evil was in him before, and hence he belongs to humankind (*uyirt tiṟattiṉ uḷḷapiṉ*). If you say that Arukaṉ destroyed the evil qualities (*maruvu mikka kurramēl*) and obtained perfection, (*aṟattiṉ maṉṉiṉāṉ eṉil*) [continues in the next verse].

VERSE 152

aṟattiṉ maṉṉu vittavaṉ oruttaṉāy avaṉ aṟat
tiṟattil nirral marrorutta ṉālvi ḷainta ceytiyām
maṟattiṉ arra varkkelām vaṇakkam uṉ iṟaikku mēl
piṟakkum iṅku avattaikoṇṭatu ārai iṉṟu pēciṭē.

[in addition, if your Arukaṉ attained perfection after getting rid of evil qualities, then there must be someone else who taught him the virtues? Hence, we have to presume the existence of a superior god who is more powerful than Arukaṉ who is being worshipped by the non-violent group].

TRANSLATION:

There must be one who established the rules for righteous behavior (*aṟattiṉ maṉṉu vittavaṉ oruttaṉāy*); it [also] implies (*viḷainta ceytiyām*) another [agent] (*marr oruttaṉāl*) who followed these rules (*avaṉ aṟat tiṟattil nirral*). Explain to me (*pēciṭē*) who that god is (*avattaikoṇṭatu ārai iṉṟu*) who appears to be superior to

---

[453] The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out that the cool nature of the moon is inherent (*samavāya sambandha*) [Sanskrit], whereas the attributes described are acquired (*samyoga sambandha*) [Sanskrit]. According to the rules of logic, they cannot be equated. MUTALIAR 1910:234. In Indian logic, two kinds of relationship are pointed out—*samavāya* or inherence, and *samyoga* or contact. *Samavāya sambandha* is the inseparable relation that is seen between the whole and its parts, the class and the individual, the substance and its attribute, the actor and the action. *Samyoga sambandha* is the external relation between two objects, e.g., a drum and a stick. VIDYABHUSANA 1988 (Reprint):32,86.

your god (*uṉ iṟaikku mēl piṟakkum*) and who is worshipped by those who do not kill any life (*maṟattiṉ aṟṟavark kelām aṇakkam*).[454]

VERSE 153

karuvi taṉ toṭakkuoḻintu kaṇṭu vāḻum eṉṟiyēl
uruvu koṇṭu niṉṟatueṉṉil uṇṭu tāṉma ṉātikaḷ
oruvi niṉṟatu eṉṉil attam oṉṟaiyum uṇarntiṭāṉ
poruḷte rintu pōkaikālam oṉṟilē puṇarntiṭāṉ.

["You claim that Arukaṉ was omniscient but did not derive his knowledge by the use of sense organs. If he was embodied, then he should have had a mind. If he was not embodied, then he could not be omniscient. Without senses, and without being cognizant of the three periods of time, it is impossible to know an object"].

TRANSLATION:

[You say that Arukaṉ] abandoned knowledge derived from the use of sense organs (*karuvi taṉ toṭakku oḻintu*) and is omniscient (*kaṇṭu vāḻum eṉṟiyēl*). If it is held that he is embodied (*uruvu koṇṭu niṉṟatu eṉṉil*), then he possesses sense organs such as the mind [etc.] (*maṉa ātikaḷ uṇṭu*). If it is held that he is without [sense organs] (*oruvi niṉṟatu eṉṉil*), he will not understand anything (*attam oṉṟaiyum uṇarntiṭāṉ*). He cannot grasp the passage [of three periods] of time (*pōkai kālam*) at the same single instant (*oṉṟilē*), to grasp anything (*poruḷ terintu puṇarntiṭāṉ*).

VERSE 154

ārva kōpa māṉavai aṭaintu oṟuppa varkku elām
cērvatu iṉmai ceppiliṉṟu cīvaṉ mēvu kāyamāl
orum maṉṉar pōlavē uyirkku aḷittal iṉṟiyē

[454] The words *maṟattiṉ aṟṟavar* refer to those who desist from killing any life. See MUTALIAR 1910:235.

ērkoḷ poṉ eyiliṭattu iruttal peṟṟatu eṅkolō.

["Being embodied implies that Arukaṉ has not attained salvation. Should that be the case, then those who have eliminated evil thoughts and emotions cannot yet expect to attain salvation. Furthermore, if Arukaṉ is compassionate towards humanity, why is he still living in luxury"?].

TRANSLATION:

If Arukaṉ is still [embodied as] a soul with a body (*cīvaṉ mēvu kāyamāl*), [then it suggests that] there is no salvation (*cērvatu iṉmai*) to those who have experienced lust, anger and other emotions (*ārva kōpam āṉavai aṭaintu*) and eventually controlled them (*oṟuppa varkku elām*). If you compare him to a king (*maṉṉar pōlavē*) who confers benefits to humankind [his subjects] (*uyirkku aḷittal*), why is he (*ērkoḷ*) living in a great (*peṟṟatu*) golden castle (*poṉ eyiliṭattu iruttal eṅkolō*)?[455]

VERSE 155

collatu oṉṟu koṇṭu ikaliṉ āttaṉ nāṭa vēcoliṉ
illai yāmma ṉātitāṉ iyampu māṟatu eṅṅaṉē
nalla vāmma ṉātitāṉ avarkku nāṭa vēyilai
ollai ūmar ūmarukku uraitta vāṟuatu okkumē.

["If Arukaṉ does not possess a mind and sense organs, how did he manage to compose a treatise? If he did not have the sense of hearing, how could he have heard his preceptor, which enabled him to teach others? This is akin to a dumb person teaching to another dumb person ('blind leading the blind')"].

TRANSLATION:

---

[455] The Tamil word *kol* is an affix implying doubt. It is also used as an expletive in poetry. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "kol" (p. 1156)*.

If you say that [by] using the single word uttered (*collatu oṉṟu koṇṭu*) [by the eternal Arukaṉ], the perfected one (*ikaliṉ āttaṉ*)[456] compiled the treatises (*nāṭavē coliṉ*). [In addition, if the perfected one] does not have a mind and other senses (*illaiyām maṉātitāṉ*), how could he compile a treatise (*iyampu māṟatu eṅṅaṉē*)? Without a sound mind (*nallavām maṉātitāṉ*), how could he (*avarkku*) comprehend (*nāṭa vēyilai*) [what was given to him]? This is comparable (*atu okkumē*) to a dumb [person] teaching another dumb [person] (*ūmar ūmarukku uraitta vāṟu*).

VERSE 156

iṉpa pūmi cērikalil nātaṉ ivvi runilat
tuṉpam aṅku uṇarntiṭāmai iṅku aṟintu colliṭāṉ
iṉpa pūmi yiliruntu irunti yāvum eytiṭil
tuṉpa pūmi yāmuṇarntu colla vallatu illaiyē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin wants to know how Arukaṉ could comprehend the sufferings and travails of the people while living in his luxurious abode. If Arukaṉ could know the sufferings from where he lives, then his abode is not immune to misery].

TRANSLATION:

If Arukaṉ lives in a blissful territory (*iṉpa pūmi cērikalil nātaṉ*), there [in his golden castle], he will not realize (*aṅku uṇarntiṭāmai*) the sorrow prevailing in this world (*ivvirunilat tuṉpam*), nor can he teach anything here [in this world] (*iṅku aṟintu colliṭāṉ*). If he knows [experiences] everything (*yāvum eytiṭil*) while living in the blissful territory (*iṉpa pūmi yiliruntu iruntil*), realize [know] that (*uṇarntu*) it also becomes a sorrowful territory (*tuṉpa pūmi yām*), [and] there is nothing else for

[456] Verse 146 describes how the eternal Arukaṉ imparted knowledge to his followers with a single word. Based on that, this verse describes the two natures of Arukaṉ—the eternal one and the perfected one—who received knowledge from the former.

me to tell you (*colla vallatu illaiyē*).

VERSE 157

niṟaintu kāya mōṭucīvaṉ niṉṟa tākil ivvuṭal
kuṟainta pōtu tāṉum ittoṭu okkavē kuṟaintiṭum
iṟantu pōkum ikkaṭam iṟanta pōtu nīrkkuṭattu
uṟaintu uṭainti ṭakkuṭam ularnta vāṟuatu okkumē.

["If the soul dwells in the body, when the body dies, the soul will die with it. It is similar to a pot that cannot hold water when it is broken"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that the soul pervades the entire body (*niṟaintu kāyamōṭu cīvaṉ niṉṟa tākil*), then if the body suffers any loss [mutilation] (*ivvuṭal kuṟainta pōtu*), the soul must also undergo similar (*okkavē*) damage (*tāṉum ittoṭu kuṟaintiṭum*). When the body dies (*ikkaṭam iṟanta pōtu*), the soul will also die (*iṟantu pōkum*) [with it]. It is comparable (*okkumē*) to how water in a water pot (*nīrk kuṭattu*) dries up (*ularnta vāṟuatu*) when the pot is broken (*uṭaintiṭak kuṭam*).

VERSE 158

kaṇṭa nūlta rumtaṉmātti kāyamōṭu ataṉmum
uṇṭu mītu kīḻ ulāvi uṟṟu niṉṟi ṭapporuḷ
koṇṭatu eṉṉil attamiv iraṇṭu taṉmai kūṭiṭā
vaṇṭu puṭkaḷ pōl eṉiṉ vaḻaṅkiṭā kaṇattilē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin asserts that the soul cannot live concomitantly in a dharmic and an adharmic body.[457] Should the Nigaṇḍavādin retort that the two

[457] The Jains believe that the soul enjoys the bliss while embodied in the *taṉmāttikāyam* (dharmic body) depending on the good deeds performed and suffers the pain with the *ataṉmāttikāyam* (adharmic body) due to the bad deeds committed. In the same birth, the soul

lives are similar to the evolution of a worm into an insect, the Śaiva Siddhāntin's answer is that the two forms cannot be present simultaneously but only in succession. Therefore, the soul dwelling in two bodies simultaneously is not tenable].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that (*eṉṉil*) the dharmic body and the adharmic body (*taṉmātti kāyamōṭu ataṉmum uṇṭu*)[458] described in the scriptures (*kaṇṭa nūl tarum*) travel high and low (*mītu kīḻ ulāvi*)[459] assuming the same body (*uṟṟu niṉṟi ṭapporuḷ koṇṭatu*) [at the same time], the two natures cannot coexist (*attamiv iraṇṭu taṉmai kūṭiṭā*). If you say it is akin to a larva metamorphosing into a bee (*vaṇṭu puṭkaḷ pōl eṉiṉ*)[460], [know that] they do not live [have both forms] at the same instant [time] (*vaḻaṅkiṭā kaṇattilē*).

VERSE 159

nīṭu pāva puṇṇiyaṅka ḷāl niraya vāṉakam
kūṭu vōrkaḷ iṉṟuniṉṟu kūṭṭuvārkaḷ iṉmaiyiṉ
ōṭum mākaṇait tiṟattiṉ uṟṟa vāṟu uraittiyēl
vīṭu mākaṇaikku nāṭum villi pōla vēṇṭumē.

[If the Nigaṇḍavādin claims that there is no final arbiter to judge the souls for their good or evil actions, then no one can enjoy the bliss that heaven provides or experience the torment in store in hell. If the Nigaṇḍavādin suggests that just as an arrow released from the bow reaches the target quickly, the souls reach their destinations, the Śaiva Siddhāntin is quick to point out, working on the same simile, that we need an archer to release the arrow!].

---

travels back and forth between the two bodies. See MUTTAPPAN 2003:117.

[458] Verse 149 describes the kinds of bodies, gross and subtle.

[459] The dharmic body is elevated to enjoy pleasures and the adharmic body is lowered to suffer pain PIḶḶAI 1975:76.

[460] The word *puṭkaḷ* is a corrupt form of puḻukkaḷ. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "puṭkaḷ" (p. 2792)*.

TRANSLATION:

If there is no arbiter (*kūṭṭuvārkaḷ iṉmaiyiṉ*) to judge the souls (*kūṭu vōrkaḷ*) for their evil acts and righteous acts (*pāva puṇṇiyaṅkaḷāl*), then no one will reach (*iṉṟuniṉṟu*) hell or heaven (*niraya vāṉakam*). If you say that (*uraittiyēl*) just as an arrow in motion (*ōṭum mākaṇait tiṟattiṉ*) reaches its destination (*uṟṟa vāṟu*), [that is, the souls reach their destinations], then we need (*vēṇṭumē*) an archer (*villi*) who releases the arrow traveling towards heaven (*vīṭu mākaṇaikku nāṭum pōla*).

VERSE 160

ēṇatu oṉṟu puṟkalattiṉ eytum eṉṉiṉ nācamē
kāṇal ākum akkaṭam kaḻinta taṉmai illavai
pūṇa vēṇṭum mēluṟum poruttam iṉmai oṉṟiṉiṉ
māṇa vē aṇupporuḷ nikaṇṭa vāti vaittatē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out the misconception of the Nigaṇḍavādin. If inanimate objects possess a soul, as claimed by the Nigaṇḍavādin, then they must long for and attain salvation. It is ridiculous to hold such a view].

TRANSLATION:

You hold that (*eṉṉiṉ*) inanimate objects (*puṟkalattiṉ eytum*)[461] have souls but with one sense (*ēṇatu oṉṟu*). Objects with life are observed (*kāṇal*) to lose their forms when they die (*nācamē ākum akkaṭam*), but [inanimate objects] do not have the nature to perish (*kaḻinta taṉmai illavai*); [If they have a soul as you claim,] they must desire salvation (*pūṇa vēṇṭum*). Such a view (*mēluṟum*) is meaningless (*poruttam iṉmai*). Only the Nigaṇḍavādin asserts that (*nikaṇṭavāti vaittatē māṇavē*) inanimate objects (*oṉṟiṉiṉ aṇupporuḷ*) [have life].

[461] In verse 150, it was suggested by the Nigaṇḍavādin that inanimate objects such as iron and stone have a soul.

VERSE 161

āṟu kāri yaṅkaḷmāṟa vēta vaṅka ḷāmeṉiṉ
māṟi vāṇi kamceyātu irukka vantiṭā taṉam
mīṟi lāta ūḻatueṉṉiṉ eṅkum uḷḷatu ūḻatē
pēṟu kāri yamviṭap piṟappatu illai pēcilē.

[The Nigaṇḍavādin holds that only by carrying out the six prescribed activities, can one perform austerities. If it is suggested that inability to carry out the activity is due to past karma, then everything can be attributed to past karma. The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out the circular logic].

TRANSLATION:

You say that forsaking (*māṟavē*) the six activities (*āṟu kāriyaṅkaḷ*)[462] is similar to performing austerities (*tavaṅkaḷām eṉiṉ*). Without exchange (*māṟi*) [of goods] and performing trades (*vāṇikam ceyātu irukka*), wealth cannot be generated (*taṉam vantiṭā*). If you attribute that [inability to produce wealth] to past karma (*mīṟilāta ūḻatu eṉṉiṉ*),[463] then everything can be attributed to past karma (*eṅkum uḷḷatu ūḻatē*). There are no benefits born [out of austerity] (*piṟappatu illai*) except by action (*pēṟu kāriyam viṭa*).

VERSE 162

uṭalva runtal mātavaṅkaḷ uṟuti eṉṟu uraittiṭil
paṭava runtu nōyiṉōrkaḷ paṭarvar poṉeyil eṉāy
tiṭamva runtal iṉpamiccai ceytal ceytal ceytiyēl
keṭaa rinti ṭāy uṉnāci kēṭil iṉpam muṉṉiyē.

---

[462] This comment is based on the strongly held Jaina belief that austerity is performed when the following six activities, which are considered evil actions, are eradicated: agriculture (*uḻavu*), mechanical work (*toḻil*) writing (*varaivu*), trading (*vāṇipam*), teaching (*viccai*), and sculpture (*ciṟpam*). MUTALIAR 1910:251.

[463] It appears the poet is using the word *ūḻatu* instead of *ūḻviṉai* to mean past karma. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "ūḻviṉai" (p. 502)*.

["If you claim that mortification of the body is a great penance, then all those who are suffering should attain salvation. Then, could someone attain salvation by cutting off his nose?"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say (*eṉṟu uraittiṭil*) that mortification of the body (*uṭal varuntal*) definitely (*uṟuti*) equals great penance (*mā tavaṅkaḷ*), then those who are suffering (*paṭa varuntu paṭarvar*) from diseases (*nōyiṉōrkaḷ*) should reach the golden castle (*poṉ eyil eṉāy*). If you reply that the desire [to reach the golden castle] is in itself (*iṉpam iccai ceytal*) an act of (*ceytal*) undergoing severe [bodily] pain (*tiṭam varuntal*), then for the sake of obtaining that bliss (*iṉpam muṉṉiyē*), may you cut off your nose (*uṉ nāci arintiṭāy*)?

VERSE 163

pūrva kaṉmam aṟṟiṭap pucitta piṉpu poṉṉeyil
nērvatu eṉṉiṉ akkaṉmattu niccayam ilāmaiyil
tīrvatu iṉmai tīriṉvāyil cērvatu iṉmai teṇkaṭal
nīrva ṟanta pōtu pūñai mīṉ arunta niṉṟatē.

[The Siddhāntin argues that as the accumulation of karma is limitless, it cannot be exhausted. Even if it were to be exhausted, at that stage there would be no body or senses to perform the austerities, and hence there would be no liberation. It will be comparable to a cat waiting for the ocean to dry up so that it can eat the fish therein].

TRANSLATION:

[You say that] only after experiencing (*aṟṟiṭap pucitta piṉpu*) all the karma of the past lives (*pūrva kaṉmam*) one can reach the golden abode [in this birth] (*poṉṉeyil nērvatu eṉṉiṉ*). [However], that karma (*akkaṉmattu*) is limitless (*niccayam ilāmaiyil*), and hence, it cannot be exhausted (*tīrvatu iṉmai*). If it is

exhausted (*tīriṉ*), the senses (*vāyil*) will not be able to combine [interact to produce knowledge] (*cērvatu iṉmai*). [Therefore what you say is analogous to] a cat (*pūñai*) waiting (*niṉṟatē*) for the water in the ocean (*teṇ kaṭal nīr*) to dry up (*vaṟanta pōtu*), so that it can eat the fish (*mīṉ arunta*).

VERSE 164

kūṟu kūval maṉṉum akkuṭamku ṟittu nīḷkarai
ēṟal uṟṟa taṉmainī oruttar iṉṟi ēṟutal
vēṟō ruttaṉ akkuṭattai mītu niṉṟu eṭukkavē
ēṟal uṟṟa taṉmaiyil civaṉ tiṟattil niṉṟiṭē.

["Just as a pot cannot lift itself from the bottom of the well to the top, one cannot attain salvation without the help of Śiva"].

TRANSLATION:

Your statement (*kūṟu*) that without the help of god (*oruttar iṉṟi*) you have the wherewithal (*nī uṟṟa taṉmai*) to reach heaven (*ēṟal ēṟutal*) is similar to saying a pot [bucket] (*akkuṭam*) at the bottom of a well (*kūval*) can lift itself (*maṉṉum*) to the top of the well (*nīḷkarai kuṟittu*). Someone (*vēṟōruttaṉ*) is needed to lift the pot (*akkuṭattai*) out from the well (*mītu niṉṟu eṭukkavē*). Declare your loyalty to Śiva (*civaṉ tiṟattil niṉṟiṭē*) and follow the required path to heaven (*ēṟal uṟṟa taṉmaiyil*).

4.7A ĀJĪVAKA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 165-174)

VERSE 165

eṉṉuyir ataṟkup pōla evarkkum ottu iruppavaṉ eṉṟu
taṉṉuyir varuntat tāṉum talaiyiṉaip paṟittup pārmēl
maṉṉuyir evaṟṟi ṉukkum varuntavē aṟaṅkaḷ collum
aṉṉatōr vāymai āci vakaṉama ṇarkaḷiṟ kūṟum.

[This verse begins the protagonist argument for the Ājīvika sect. The Śaiva Siddhāntin uses sarcasm by alluding to the sect's practice of self-mortification by

pulling out the hair from their heads].

TRANSLATION:

Just as he has been [benevolent] to my soul (*eṉṉuyir ataṟkup pōla eṉṟu*), he will be benevolent to every soul (*evarkkum ottu iruppavaṉ*). Pulling out [one's hair] from the head (*talaiyiṉaip paṟittu*) causes suffering to the soul (*taṉṉuyir varuntat tāṉum*). On this earth (*pār mēl*), the Ājīvika sect belonging to the Jaina school (*ācivakaṉ amaṇarkaḷiṟ*)[464] preaches the sublime truth (*aṉṉatōr vāymai kūṟum*) that all souls should undergo bodily suffering (*maṉṉuyir evaṟṟiṉukkum varuntavē*) as postulated in their scriptures (*aṟaṅkaḷ collum*).

VERSE 166

varampilā aṟivaṉ āti vaittaṉūṟ poruḷkaḷ tāmum
nirampavē aṇukkaḷ aintu nilampuṉal aṉalkāl cīvaṉ
parantivai niṉṟa pāṉmai pāratu kaṭiṉam cītam
tarumpuṉal cuṭumtī vāyuc calittuṭum uyirpō tattām.

[The five elements and their characteristics are described].

TRANSLATION:

The all-pervading Arukaṉ (*varampilā aṟivaṉ*)[465] in his eternal treatise (*āti vaittaṉūṟ*) identifies five elements (*aṇukkaḷ aintu*) and [says that] all objects (*poruḷkaḷ tāmum*) will be filled by them (*nirampavē*). They are: earth (*nilam*), water (*puṉal*), fire (*aṉal*), air (*kāl*) and the soul (*cīvaṉ*). If we should describe their respective nature (*parantivai niṉṟa pāṉmai*), earth is hardness (*pāratu kaṭiṉam*), water is coldness (*cītam tarum puṉal*), fire is heat (*cuṭumtī*), air is movement (*vāyuc calittuṭum*), and soul is intelligence (*uyirpō tattām*).

---

[464] Aruṇanti makes a mistake by identifying the Ājīvika sect as part of the Jaina school.

[465] The word *aṟivaṉ* means a wise man, a knowledgeable person. It also refers to Arukaṉ. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "aṟivaṉ" (p. 177)*.

VERSE 167

pārpuṉal parakkum kīḻmēl paṭarntiṭum tēyu vāyuc
cērvatu vilaṅkiṉ uḷḷam avaṟṟoṭu cērum vēṟu
cārvatu peṟṟa pōtu cārnap poruḷiṉ taṉmai
nērvatum āki niṟkum ituporuḷ nikaḻttum āṟē.

["Of the five elements, earth and water have the nature to move downwards, whereas fire and air have the tendency to move upwards. The soul, while embodied, assumes the characteristics of the body, and on leaving the body it merges with the elements"].

TRANSLATION:

Earth and water (*pār puṉal*) have the nature of spreading downwards (*parakkum kīḻ*), [whereas] fire and air (*tēyu vāyu*) have the nature to spread upwards (*mēl paṭarntiṭum*). When the soul (*uḷḷam*) leaves [the body] (*cērvatu vilaṅkiṉ*), it will merge with them [the elements] (*avaṟṟoṭu cērum*). When the soul enters a body (*vēṟu cārvatu peṟṟa pōtu*), it assumes (*nērvatum āki niṟkum*) the characteristics of the body in which it is embodied (*cārntha apporuḷiṉ taṉmai*). This is how these substances [elements] operate (*ituporuḷ nikaḻttum āṟē*).

VERSE 168

uṇartarā aṇukkaḷ nāṉkum oṉṟuketṭu oṉṟatu ākā
puṇartarā oṉṟil pukkoṉṟu āyiṉum porunti vāḻum
aṇaitarā putiya vantiṅku aḻitarā paḻaiya vāṉa
iṇaitarā oṉṟuoṉ ṟāki māṟutal oṉṟum iṉṟē.

["Except for the soul, the four substances do not possess any knowledge, although they all inhabit the body and function in unison. They neither merge into each other nor do they metamorphose into another. They are not affected by the passing of time"].

TRANSLATION:

The four elements do not have any intelligence (*uṇartarā aṇukkaḷ nāṉkum*).[466] One [element] will not metamorphose into another (*oṉṟuketṭu oṉṟatu ākā*), nor will it merge with another (*puṇartarā oṉṟil pukkoṉṟu*). Yet (*āyiṉum*), they stay united [in the body] (*porunti vāḻum*). They are not born here as new (*aṇaitarā putiya vantiṅku*), nor do they die as old (*aḻitarā paḻaiya vāṉa*). When they unite, they do not unite one by one (*iṇaitarā oṉṟu oṉṟāki*), and they never change in their nature (*māṟutal oṉṟum iṉṟē*).

VERSE 169

koṇṭumuṉ virittal nīṭṭal kuṟukkutal kuvittal ūṉṟal
uṇṭutiṉṟu ularttal mīṭṭal uṭaittiṭal oṉṟum oṇṇā
viṇṭupiṉ puṟampum pōkum vēṟuniṉṟu uḷḷum mēvum
paṇṭumiṉṟu eṉṟum eṅkum parantuoru taṉmaip pālē.

[The characteristics of the elements are outlined].

TRANSLATION:

They do not have the wherewithal (*oṉṟum oṇṇā*) to expand (*virittal*), to lengthen (*nīṭṭal*), to shorten (*kuṟukkutal*), or to accumulate (*kuvittal*). They cannot be poured (*ūṉṟal*), they cannot be eaten (*uṇṭutiṉṟu*), they cannot be retrieved (*mīṭṭal*), and they cannot be broken up (*uṭaittiṭal*). They can go beyond the worlds (*viṇṭupiṉ puṟampum pōkum*), and they can assume several forms and lives (*vēṟuniṉṟu uḷḷum mēvum*). Although they are present (*parantu*) all the time (*eṉṟum*) from the past to the present (*paṇṭum iṉṟu*), everywhere (*eṅkum*), their nature will not change (*oru taṉmaip pālē*).

VERSE 170

[466] *Aṇukkaḷ* in this context refers to the elements and not atoms.

kaṇṇiṉil kāṇa oṇṇāc caṉitta antak kaṉmattālē
naṇṇiṭum urukkaḷ āki niṉṟapiṉ nararō kāṇpār
viṇṇiṉil tēvar kāṇpar ōraṇu mikka nāṉkāy
eṇṇiya poruḷkaḷ ellām icaivatueṉṟu iyampu miṉṉē.

["Invisible to the eyes, karma is instrumental in embodying the soul with a form. Even when embodied, the souls can be perceived only by the celestials. Our treatises state that the soul combines with the four elements and in unison with them appears as different objects"].

TRANSLATION:

They are impossible to be perceived by the eye (*kaṇṇiṉil kāṇa oṇṇā*), and they are born due to past karma (*caṉitta antak kaṉmattālē*). Even when they take forms and appear (*naṇṇiṭum urukkaḷ āki niṉṟapiṉ*), humans do not see them (*nararō kāṇpār*); they are seen by [only] the celestial bodies in the heaven (*viṇṇiṉil tēvar kāṇpar*). One element [the soul] (*ōraṇu*) combines with the four [other elements] (*mikka nāṉkāy*) and appears as several objects (*eṇṇiya poruḷkaḷ ellām*) and [functions] in harmony (*icaivatu*); thus say [the treatises] (*eṉṟu iyampum iṉṉē*).

VERSE 171

oṉṟiṉai oruvi mūṉṟaṅku uṟṟiṭā iraṇṭu viṭṭu
niṉṟiṭā iraṇṭu kūṭum neṟinilam nāṉku nīrmuṉṟu
iṉṟu iraṇṭu aḻalkāl oṉṟāy icaintiṭum pūmi ivvāṟu
eṉṟunīr tīkāl āti īṇṭuvatu eṉṟu iyampum.

[The syntax of this verse needs some unpacking. The Ājīvika sect holds that any composition of the elements will always have the four elements (earth, water, fire, and air) but in different proportions to produce various objects. This suggests that two or three of these cannot produce any form. However, with earth, all the four will be united together; with water, the other two (fire, and air) will be found

together; with fire air will be found together; and air will stand alone. The four elements mix this way among themselves].

TRANSLATION:

[When the four elements unite], three of them do not unite (*mūṉṟaṅku uṟṟiṭā*) leaving out one (*oṉṟiṉai oruvi*); two of them do not unite (*niṉṟiṭā iraṇṭu*), leaving out the other two (*iraṇṭu viṭṭu*); [the element] earth has four [attributes] (*nilam nāṉku*), water has three (*nīr muṉṟu*), fire has two (*iraṇṭu aḻal*) and air has only one (*kāl oṉṟāy*). Their [treatises] say (*eṉṟu iyampum*) that in this paradigm (*kūṭum neṟi*) of the world (*īṇṭuvatu*), elements such as (*āti*) earth (*pūmi*), water (*nīr*), fire (*tī*) and air (*kāl*) thus work in unison (*ivvāṟu icaintiṭum*).

VERSE 172

veṇmainaṉ poṉmai cemmai kaḻiveṇmai nīlam paccai
uṇmaiiv āṟiṉ uḷḷum kaḻiveṇmai ōṅku vīṭṭiṉ
vaṇmaiya tākac cērum maṟṟivai uruvam paṟṟi
uṇmaiiv voṭṭut tīṭṭuk kalappiṉil uṇarum eṉṟāṉ.

[The characteristics and the nature of the six colors are explained].

TRANSLATION:

[The six colors are] white (*veṇmai*), gold (*naṉ poṉmai*), red (*cemmai*), pure white (*kaḻiveṇmai*), blue (*nīlam*), and green (*paccai*). Among these six (*ivāṟiṉ uḷḷum*), the pure white (*kaḻiveṇmai*) will provide beauty (*vaṇmaiya tākac cērum*) to the heaven [golden castle] (*ōṅku vīṭṭiṉ*). The other [elements] (*maṟṟivai*) inhere in forms (*uruvam paṟṟi*). It is said (*eṉṟāṉ*) in essence (*uṇmaii*) that the soul knows that (*uṇarum*) by means of association and dissociation [by differentiation] (*voṭṭut tīṭṭuk kalappiṉil*).

VERSE 173

pēriḻavu iṭaiyūṟu iṉpam pirivilātu irukkai maṟṟum

vēr̲oru nāṭṭil cēr̲al viḻaintiṭum mūppuc cātal
kūr̲iya eṭṭum muṉṉē karuviṉuṭ koṇṭa tākum
tēr̲iya ūl̲i̲r̲ paṭṭuc celvatuiv ulakam eṉr̲āṉ.

[The eight attributes of the karmic process are explained].

TRANSLATION:

In the womb itself (*karuviṉ*), the soul assumes (*muṉṉē uṭkoṇṭa tākum*) the eight attributes (*eṭṭum*) stated (*kūr̲iya*) as: abject poverty (*pēr il̲avu*) pleasure (*iṉpam*), not leaving the native land (*pirivilātu irukkai*), living in a foreign land (*vēr̲oru nāṭṭil cēr̲al*), old age (*mūppu*) and the resulting (*viḻaintiṭum*) death (*cātal*). He [Arukaṉ] has said that (*eṉr̲āṉ*) the world thus undergoes (*paṭṭuc celvatuiv ulakam*) the karmic process (*ūl̲i̲r̲*).

VERSE 174

puṇṇiya pāvam eṉṉum iraṇṭu aṇup porunta vaittē
eṇṇiya ivar̲r̲i ṉōṭum ēl̲eṉa eṅka ḷōṭē
naṇṇiya oruvaṉ kūr̲um ñāṉamiv vār̲atu eṉr̲u
kaṇṇiya karutti ṉōrkaḷ katiyiṉaik kāṇpar eṉr̲āṉ.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin concludes the position of the Ājīvikas in this verse. “Arukaṉ has added two more categories of vice and sin to the five substances (earth, water, fire, air, and soul) of the Jaina school making it seven. Those who recognize this scheme stated by our friend (Arukaṉ) as the highest wisdom will attain salvation (reach Arukaṉ’s golden abode)].

TRANSLATION:

The two elements [attributes] (*iraṇṭu aṇu*), righteous acts and sinful acts (*puṇṇiya pāvam eṉṉum*) combine with (*porunta vaittē*) [the five] already accounted for (*eṇṇiya ivar̲r̲i ṉōṭum*) making them to be seven (*ēl̲eṉa*); those who follow (*kaṇṇiya karutti ṉōrkaḷ*) what our revered friend has stated (*eṅkaḷōṭē naṇṇiya oruvaṉ*

kūṟum)[467] as words of wisdom (*ñāṉam ivvāṟatu eṉṟu*), will realize salvation (*katiyiṉaik kāṇpar*).

4.7B ĀJĪVIKA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 175-180)

VERSE 175

vārāneṟi vīṭṭāṉapiṉ maṇmēl avaṉ vantu
tārāmaiyiṉ nūlāṉatu tāṉō uḷatu iṉṟām
cērāmaiyil aṇuvāṉavai aintum oru tēyattu
ōrāṉoru kālattiṉil oṉṟām uṇarvu iṉṟām.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his refutation of the Ājīvika school. He challenges the Ājīvika position that Arukaṉ appeared on this earth and wrote treatises. "As there is no return from heaven, he could not have appeared on earth to compose the treatises; nor could the treatises have appeared on their own. As the elements cannot unite themselves in heaven, he could not have had a body. Therefore he could never be aware of anything"].

TRANSLATION:

If [Arukaṉ] did not compose (*tārāmaiyiṉ*) the treatises (*nūlāṉatu*) by appearing on this earth (*maṇmēl avaṉ vantu*), [understand that] they did not appear on their own (*tāṉō uḷatu iṉṟām*). However, there is no return from the heaven (*vārāneṟi vīṭṭāṉapiṉ*). The five elements (*aṇuvāṉavai aintum*) will not unite (*cērāmaiyil*) [in his abode] and Arukaṉ will not have a body (*oru tēyattu*). [In addition, without a body] he cannot perceive anything, at any time (*ōrāṉ oru kālattiṉil*), nor can he be conscious of anything (*oṉṟām uṇarvu iṉṟām*).

VERSE 176

irupāṉmaiyar ivarmaṇṭalar cempōtakar eṉṟē

---

[467] The Ājīvika promotes himself as a friend of Arukaṉ by stating "*eṅkaḷōṭṭē naṇṇiya oruvaṉ.*"

varupāṉmaiyar ivarmaṇṭalar maṇmēlvaru nūlum
tarupāṉmaiyar eṉiṉnītalam atil vāḻpavar tampōl
orupāṉmaiyiṉ uḷarākuvar uṇarātu urai ceytāy.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin questions the validity of the two natures of Arukaṉ as advocated by the Ājīvika and points out the misunderstanding].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that (*eṉiṉ nī*) Arukaṉ has two natures (*irupāṉmaiyar ivar eṉṟē*), one as Maṇṭalar (*maṇṭalar*)[468] and the other as Cempōtakar (*cempōtakar*), and Maṇṭalar is the one (*varupāṉmaiyar ivarmaṇṭalar*) who composed the treatise (*nūlum tarupāṉmaiyar*) on the earth (*maṇmēlvaru*), then he will have the same nature (*orupāṉmaiyiṉ uḷarākuvar*) as all other souls living on this earth (*talam atil vāḻpavar tampōl*). You have stated this (*urai ceytāy*) without proper understanding (*uṇarātu*).

VERSE 177

uyirāṉavai uṭal tīṇṭiṭal oṭṭuk kalappu eytum
payilvāl uṇarvu eytum eṉum moḻiyāṉavai paḻutām
tuyilārtarum avarpālakar toṭarāraṟi viṉainī
ceyirārtarum uraiyētarum ituvō uṉa ceyalē.

[This verse challenges the Ājīvika position that the soul combines with the body and becomes intelligent. If that were so, why does not an infant or an unintelligent person display knowledge?]

TRANSLATION:

Your words which state that (*eṉum moḻiyāṉavai*) when the soul enters the body

[468] *Maṇṭala*r is the one living on earth and *cempōtakar* is the knowledgeable one or the perfected one. MUTALIAR 1910:270.

(*uyirāṉavai uṭal tīṇṭiṭal*), it combines and attaches itself to the body (*oṭṭuk kalappu eytum*) and by practice (*payilvāl*) knowledge is formed (*uṇarvu eytum*) are faulty (*paḻutām*). The soul in those who are lethargic (*tuyilārtarum*) and in infants (*pālakar*) will not become knowledgeable (*toṭarār aṟiviṉai*) as faultily (*ceyirārtarum*) advocated by you (*uraiyētarum*). This is your position [which is not tenable] (*ituvō uṉ ceyalē*).

VERSE 178

aṇuvāṉavai kīḻmēluḷa āṉālava yavamum
naṇukāveṉa lāmēvariṉ nācam avai eytum
aṇukāeṉil ivaitoḷḷaikoḷ ākamuḷa vākun
tuṇivālivai kalavāpala tokaiyāmvakai ilavām.

[In an earlier verse,[469] the Ājīvika had claimed that of the four substances, two have the nature for downward movement and two have the tendency for upward movement. Should this be the case, they will never form a body, as they will keep drifting apart in opposite directions. Even if they unite, at any time they may separate themselves destroying the body in the process. Furthermore, if the substances are independent as claimed by the Ājīvika, then there should be space between them thus failing to provide unity and harmony. The Śaiva Siddhāntin successfully dismantles the Ājīvika position that the body is a composite of the four substances].

TRANSLATION:

If the elements (*aṇuvāṉavai*) either go down or go up (*kīḻmēluḷa āṉāl*), then we can say (*eṉalame*) that even body parts (*avayavamum*) can go down or up (*naṇukā*); if so, when the elements unite (*variṉ*) they will perish (*nācam avai eytum*). If you say they do not unite (*aṇukāeṉil*), then they will become a body with holes (*toḷḷaikoḷ ākam uḷavākum*) and will become a collection

[469] See verse 167.

(*tokaiyāmvakai*) without any unifying harmony (*kalavāpala*), and without any purpose (*tuṇivāl ivai ilavām*).

VERSE 179

mikaiyāmaṇu uḷavākaiyiṉ avaiyām mika eṉṉil
tokaināliṭai yaṟalāl avai tokumāṟila ākum
pakaiyākaiyiṉ micaitāḻmaiyiṉ nilaiyāvakai paṇṇum
nakaiyāmurai kaḻiāyiram avaitūṇeṉa naṇṇā.

[The Ājīvika claims the existence of another fifth substance (the soul), which appears in various forms. It is not possible for the soul to unite with the other four because of their movement in opposite directions. Furthermore, the soul has intelligence but not the capacity to unite. Because of the conflicting nature of the constituent substances, the union will be imperfect and lack harmony. Thus, the Ājīvaka's position is laughable. Even tying together a thousand sticks will not result in a column].

TRANSLATION:

You say that there is another element [besides the four] (*mikaiyām aṇu*), and it appears in several forms (*uḷavākaiyiṉ avaiyām mika eṉṉil*). Because they [the four elements] have an upward or downward tendency (*micai tāḻmaiyiṉ nilaiyāvakai*), they are opposed in nature (*pakaiyākaiyiṉ*). As the union of the four is not sufficient (*tokai nāliṭai yaṟalāl*), the [intelligent] element cannot be in harmony with them (*avai tokum āṟila ākum*). Even one thousand sticks (*kaḻi āyiram*) cannot come close (*naṇṇā*) to being a pillar (*avai tūṇeṉa*). [Therefore], what you say is laughable (*nakaiyām urai*)!

VERSE 180

kūṭāaṇu aṟiyāmaiyiṉ vaḻikūṭṭutal kūṟiṉ
nāṭāvaḻi aṇuvāṉavai naṇukacceyum avarai
nīṭāviṉai taṉṉāleṉiṉ niṉaiviṉṟatu iṉṟām

tēṭāy oru vaṉainī ivai ceyvāṉ uḷaṉ eṉṟē.

[In his concluding verse addressing the Ājīvika, the Śaiva Siddhāntin continues, "As the substances do not possess any intelligence, they cannot unite to form bodies. If you claim air to be the uniting agent, it cannot be so as air also does not possess any intelligence. You cannot suggest that karma is the uniting agent because it also lacks intelligence. There must be one intelligent agent to effectively unite the substances. You should investigate this further." The Śaiva Siddhāntin very effectively argues for the existence of god without mentioning it directly in as many words].

TRANSLATION:

The elements cannot unite [to form a body] (*kūṭāaṇu*), because they lack intelligence (*aṟiyāmaiyiṉ*). If you say air unites the other elements (*vaḷi kūṭṭutal kūṟiṉ*), air does not have intelligence about the karmic activity of the soul (*nāṭāvaḷi aṇuvāṉavai naṇukacceyum avarai*). If you say that air unites them because of the remnant karma (*nīṭā viṉai taṉṉāleṉiṉ*), [remember that] it is non-intelligent (*niṉaiviṉṟatu iṉṟām*). There has to be one (*uḷaṉ eṉṟē*) who implements these [activities] (*oruvaṉ ivai ceyvāṉ*). Do investigate (*nī tēṭāy*)!

4.8A BHAṬṬA MĪMĀṀSĀ SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 181-193)

VERSE 181

vētamē ōti nātaṉ ilai eṉṟu viṇṇil ēṟac
cētamām kaṉmam ceyyac ceyimiṉi ceppum nūliṉ
nītiyē koṇṭu paṭṭā cāriyiṉ nikaḻttum nīrmai
ōtanīr ñālat tuḷḷē uḷḷavāṟu uraikkal uṟṟām.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin assuming the role of the representative of the Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's school of Mīmāṁsā (Mīmāmcai in Tamil) begins by stating the basic

tenets of the school.[470] The adherents of the school do not believe in god, and as prescribed by Jaimini the founder of the Mīmāṁsā school of philosophy, the Vedas are the only guiding authority to attain salvation].

TRANSLATION:

Let us begin to discuss (*uraikkal u̲r̲rām*) the basic principles (*uḷḷavāṟu nīrmai*) of the followers of [Kumārila] Bhaṭṭa (*paṭṭā cāriyiṉ nikaḻttum*) who in this world (*ñālat uḷḷē*) surrounded by the vast ocean (*ōtanīr*), abide by the doctrines in the treatise (*nūliṉ nīṭiyē koṇṭu*) compiled by Jaimini (*ceyimiṉi ceppum*). [According to them], there is no god (*nātaṉ ilai*) besides the [authority of the] Vedas (*vētamē ōti eṉ̲r̲u*) and to follow [the Vedas'] prescriptions (*kaṉmam ceyya*) is the way (*cētamām*) to reach heaven (*viṇṇil ēṟac*).

VERSE 182

u̲r̲r̲iṭum kāmam āti kuṇaṅkaḻtām uyirkaṭku uṇṭām
ma̲r̲r̲ivai tarumē yāyiṉ maṟaimoḻi vāymai iṉṟām
ka̲r̲r̲iṭu nūlāl pōtam kalappatu kalvi iṉṟēl
pe̲r̲r̲iṭu maḻavum mūṅkai eṉṉavē pēca lāmē.

[The protagonist of the school highlights the importance of the Vedas, and points out that the soul without any intelligence is akin to a young (immature) child or a dumb person. The implication here is that one with human frailties could not have composed the Vedas].

TRANSLATION:

The souls (*uyirkaṭku uṇṭām*) experience (*u̲r̲r̲iṭum*) emotions (*kuṇaṅkaḻtām*) such

---

[470] Jaimini (circa 1st century BCE), the founder of the Mīmāṁsā school, compiled the authoritative treatise *The Mīmāṁsā Sūtra*. The founders of the two major sub schools are Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (circa 7th century CE) and Prabhākara (circa 700 CE). The names of the three in Tamil are Caimiṉi, Paṭṭāccāriyaṉ, and Pirapākarar, respectively.

as lust (*kāmam āti*). If such souls offer (*maṟṟivai tarumē yāyiṉ*) sacred words [Vedas] (*maṟaimoḻi*), there cannot be any sublime truths in them (*vāymai iṉṟām*). [Humans] acquire knowledge (*pōtam kalappatu*) from the treatises they learn (*kaṟṟiṭu nūlāl*). Without any educational value [in them] (*kalvi iṉṟēl*), we can say that (*eṉṉavē pēcalāmē*) [human authors of the Vedas] will have the nature (*peṟṟiṭu*) of a young child (*maḻavum*) or a dumb person (*mūṅkai*).

VERSE 183

uṇṭuoru kaṭavuḷ vētam uraittiṭa uyiriṉ taṉmai
koṇṭavaṉ allaṉ eṉṟum kūṟiṭiṉ uruvam kūṭil
paṇṭaiya uyirē ākum paṭittanūl aḻavu ñāṉam
kaṇṭiṭum uruvam iṉṟēl karutuvatu illai eṉṟāṉ.

[The protagonist of the school asserts that god did not create the Vedas, and they appeared on their own. He argues, “If god takes on a human form, he must possess a soul, and that soul will have intelligence conditioned and limited by the knowledge acquired from studying the treatises. On the other hand, if he does not take on a human form, he will not have a mouth to utter words and a mind to think”].

TRANSLATION:

If it is suggested (*eṉṟum kūṟiṭiṉ*) that there is a god (*uṇṭu oru kaṭavuḷ*) who authored the Vedas (*vētam uraittiṭa*) but he does not have human attributes (*uyiriṉ taṉmai koṇṭavaṉ allaṉ*), [it can be refuted as follows.] If he has a body (*uruvam kūṭil*), he will have a soul (*paṇṭaiya uyirē ākum*), and he will be limited (*kaṇṭiṭum eṉṟāṉ*) by the wisdom acquired from the study of treatises (*paṭittanūl aḻavu ñāṉam*). [Furthermore], If he has no body (*uruvam iṉṟēl*), he will be devoid of faculties [without a mind] (*karutuvatu illai*).

VERSE 184

tēvarum muṉivar tāmum cittarum nararum maṟṟum

yāvarum uraippar vētam iyampiṉar iṉṉar eṉṉap
pōvatuaṉṟu eṉṟu nāḷum paramparai pukalva tākum
kūvalnīr eṉṉil koḷḷēm maṟumaiyaik kuṟitta lālē.

["Even celestials cannot explain the origin of the Vedas. From time immemorial, the Vedas have been handed down to succeeding generations. If you suggest that they appeared just as water appears in a well, we do not accept that because it implies the existence of an agent to dig the well. Furthermore, water from the well cannot teach about future births." The simile obliquely suggests that humans cannot know about future births].

TRANSLATION:

Celestial bodies (*tēvarum*), sages (*muṉivar tāmum*), mystics (*cittarum*), and humans (*nararum*) state (*yāvarum uraippar*) that they do not know who (*iṉṉar eṉṉa*) composed the Vedas (*vētam iyampiṉar*). It has been eternally (*eṉṟu nāḷum*) handed down in a hereditary succession (*paramparai pukalva tākum*). If you say that [they appeared on their own] just as water in a well (*kūvalnīr eṉṉil*), we do not accept that (*koḷḷēm*), because the well water cannot discuss future births (*maṟumaiyaik kuṟitta lālē*).

VERSE 185

uṉṉiya aṅkam āṟum mūṉṟu upavētam tāṉum
taṉṉuḷē aṭakki vēṟu taṅkiṭā vakaiyaic cārntu
muṉṉamōr tōṟṟam iṉṟi muṭiviṉṟi nittam āki
maṉṉiōr iyalpē yāki vaḻaṅkiṭum maṟaiyatu eṉṟāṉ.

[Argument is provided for the eternal nature of the Vedas and their rich contents found in the six auxiliary texts and six secondary texts. Nothing can be found, the protagonist claims, in any philosophical treatise that is not explained in the Vedas].

TRANSLATION:

The Vedas contain within (*taṉṉuḷē aṭakki*) six great auxiliary texts (*uṉṉiya aṅkam āṟum*)[471] and three secondary texts (*mūṉṟu upavētam*).[472] No other treatise contains (*vēṟu taṅkiṭā*) what has not been discussed in them (*vakaiyaic cārntu*). They have no beginning (*muṉṉamōr tōṯṯam iṉṟi*), they have no end (*muṭiviṉṟi*), and they are eternal (*nittam āki*). Their nature never changes (*maṉṉiōr iyalpē yāki*); this is the enduring characteristic (*vaḻaṅkiṭum*) of the Vedas (*maṟaiyatu eṉṟāṉ*).

VERSE 186

ceytiyum neṟiyum mēvum tēvarum poruḷum ellām
eytiya paṉmai yālē ōriyalpu iyampātu ākum
aiyamil kālam mūṉṟum aṟintapiṉ neñca kattāy
meyyatāy vantu tōṉṟi viḻaṅkiṭum vēta nūlē.

["The Vedas dictate prescriptions and prohibitions, besides providing chants and rites to be performed. When they are practiced with perfection, their truth will dawn in the minds of the practitioners].

TRANSLATION:

[The Vedas describe] the activities (*ceytiyum*) and righteous means to carry them out (*neṟiyum*), and celestial bodies practice them (*mēvum tēvarum*). Plurality (*paṉmai yālē*) of all objects result from these (*poruḷum ellām*), and they are not of the same nature (*ōriyalpu iyampātu ākum*). When we learn with certainty (*aiyamil aṟintapiṉ*) about the three periods of time (*kālam mūṉṟum*), the truth of the Vedas (*meyyatāy vēta nūlē*) will appear (*vantu tōṉṟi*) in our minds (*neñca kattāy*) in all

[471] The six auxiliary texts (*aṅga*s in Sanskrit and *aṅkaṅkaḷ* in Tamil) are: prosody (*cantōviciti*), astronomy and astrology (*cōtiṭam*), construction and design of religious sites (*kaṟpam*), Vedic etymology (*niruttam*), phonetics (*ciṭcai*), and grammar (*viyākaraṇam*). *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "vētāṅkam" (p. 3832)*.

[472] The three secondary texts (*upavētam*) are: science of life (*āyurvētam*), science of martial arts, weaponry (*taṉurvētam*), and fine arts (*kāntaruvavētam*). *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "upavētam" (p. 427)*.

clarity (*viḷaṅkiṭum*).

VERSE 187

tappilā vākum tātup pirattiyam taṉṉi ṉōṭē
oppilā tāmpi rāti patikamām uṟuppum koṇṭu
ceppumām vētam coṉṉa vitippaṭi ceyyac cēma
vaippatām vīṭu pācam maruvalām oruva lāmē.

["If the injunctions and chants stated in the Vedas are carried out with faultless grammar and diction, one will be able to shed the worldly attachments and enjoy the fruits offered in the heaven"].

TRANSLATION:

[The Vedas] declare [injunctions] (*ceppumām*) with faultless verbal roots (*tappilā vākum tātu*) [and] grammatical prefixes (*pirattiyam*), and they contain in their corpus (*taṉṉi ṉōṭē uṟuppum koṇṭu*) the incomparable (*oppilātām*) composition of nouns (*pirātipatikamām*). If one follows the injunctions (*vētam coṉṉa*) rigorously (*vitippaṭi ceyyac*), attachments can be abandoned (*pācam oruvalāmē*) and [one] can enjoy (*maruvalām*) the pleasures of heaven (*cēma vaippatām vīṭu*).

VERSE 188

pōkkoṭu varavu kālam oṉṟiṉil puṇarvatu iṉṟi
ākkavēṟu oruvar iṉṟi anātiyāy aṇukkaḷ āki
nīkkiṭā viṉaiyiṟ kūṭi nilammuta lāka nīṭi
ūkkamār ulakam eṉṟum uḷḷatueṉṟu uraikka lāmē.

["Without anyone to create it, the great eternal universe has existed forever, and never underwent dissolution or a creation. The universe is constituted by atoms, which follow the law of karma of the souls"].

TRANSLATION:

This great universe (*ūkkamār ulakam*) has never undergone dissolution (*pōkkoṭu*) or creation (*varavu*) and has existed forever over time (*kālam oṉṟiṉil puṇarvatu iṉṟi*). Without anyone to create it [not having a creator] (*ākkavēṟu oruvar iṉṟi*), the elements exist (*aṇukkaḷ āki*) because of their everlasting karma (*nīkkiṭā viṉaiyiṟ kūṭi*), and they manifest themselves as earth etc. (*nilam mutalāka*); thus, we can say that (*eṉṟu uraikkalāmē*) the universe has always existed (*eṉṟum uḷḷatu*).

VERSE 189

nittamāy eṅkum uṇṭāy nīṭuyir aṟivu tāṉāyp
puttitāṉ ātiyāya karuviyiṉ puṟattatu ākic
cuttamāy aruvam ākit tollaival viṉaiyiṉ taṉmaikku
ottatōr uruvam paṟṟip pulaṉvaḻi uṇarntu niṟkum.

["The intelligent soul is eternal, and although it is conscious and interacts with the sense organs, it is independent of them. It is formless, yet due to its karmic residue, it dwells in a body and functions through the senses"].

TRANSLATION:

The eternal (*nittamāy*), all pervading (*eṅkum uṇṭāy*), and omnipresent soul (*nīṭuyir*) has intelligence as its form (*aṟivu tāṉāy*). When it operates with sense organs such as intellect (*puttitāṉ ātiyāya karuviyiṉ*), it maintains its integrity (*puṟattatu āki*) and stays pure (*cuttamāy*). When it is without a form (*aruvam āki*), it assumes a form (*uruvam paṟṟi*) appropriate to its remnant karma (*val viṉaiyiṉ taṉmaikku ottatōr*) [that has been active from] long past (*tollai*), is conscious, [and functions] (*uṇarntu niṟkum*) through the sense organs (*pulaṉvaḻi*).

VERSE 190

ceyaltarum viṉaikaḷ māyntu cintaiyil cērntu niṉṟu
payaṉoṭu paliyā niṟkum palālamum taḻaiyum ellām
vayaltaṉiṉ maruvi nācam vantapiṉ palattai vantuiṅku
iyalpoṭum tantāṟpōla eṉṟumpiṉ iyampu kiṉṟāṉ.

["Just as when the straw and foliage are used as manure, they (will rot, and then) reproduce themselves as nutritious manure to the crops, the past karma will attach themselves to the soul and have its effect in the next birth"].

TRANSLATION:

[When the body] perishes (*māyntu*), [the soul], because of the [accrued] karma produced by its actions (*ceyaltarum viṉaikaḷ*), assumes (*cērntu niṉṟu*) the subtle body (*cintaiyil*),[473] which, in turn, will produce its own effects (*payaṉoṭu paliyā niṟkum*). He [Bhaṭṭa] says that it is similar (*eṉṟumpiṉ iyampu kiṉṟāṉ*) to straw and foliage [when used as manure] (*palālamum taḻaiyum*), in the paddy fields (*vayaltaṉiṉ*). After they perish and lose their forms (*maruvi nācam vantapiṉ*), they will provide (*tantāṟpōla*) good nutrition to the crops (*iyalpoṭum palattai vantu iṅku*).

VERSE 191

nītiyāl nitta kaṉmam nikaḻttiṭac cupattai nīṅkār
tītilā iccā kaṉmam centaḻal ōmpic ceyya
ētutāṉ vēṇṭiṟṟu ellām eytalām cōma yākam
ātitāṉ ācai vīci amaittiṭa vīṭu atu āmē.

[By observing the injunctions prescribed in the Vedas, and by performing the sacrifices advised by the sages, one can attain salvation].

TRANSLATION:

Observing (*nikaḻttiṭa*) the daily Vedic prescriptions (*nītiyāl nitta kaṉmam*), will secure happiness (*cupattai nīṅkār*). One can achieve whatever one longs for (*ētutāṉ vēṇṭiṟṟu ellām eytalām*) by performing deeds involving desires that are not of sinful nature (*tītilā iccā kaṉmam*) and by performing fire sacrifices as advised

[473] The Tamil word *cintai* is translated as "subtle body" in this context. See MUTALIAR 1910:288.

by the sages (*centaḷal ōmpic ceyya*). By performing sacrifices such as the Sōma sacrifice (*cōma yākam āti*) and by desiring to donate liberally (*ācai vīci amaittiṭa*), one will reach heaven (*vīṭu atu āmē*).

VERSE 192

karutiya kaṉmam ñāṉam iraṇṭumkā lākak koṇṭu
maruviṭal ākum vīṭu matitaṉai matittuc ceyti
oruviṭil patitaṉ ākum patitaṉaik katiyil uykkat
taruvatōr neṟitāṉ illai eṉṉavum cāṟṟi ṉāṉē.

["Unless one performs the prescriptions of the "action path," observing the injunctions of the "knowledge path" alone will not enable one to attain salvation"].

TRANSLATION:

[The Vedas] prescribe (*karutiya*) that following both (*iraṇṭum kālākak koṇṭu*) the action path [rites] (*kaṉmam*) and the knowledge path (*ñāṉam*) will lead one to heaven [salvation] (*maruviṭal ākum vīṭu*). Emphasizing the path of knowledge (*matitaṉai matittu*) and abandoning the path of action [rites] (*ceyti oruviṭil*) will make one an apostate (*patitaṉ ākum*). He [Bhaṭṭa] holds that (*eṉṉavum cāṟṟi ṉāṉē*) there are no scriptures (*taruvatōr neṟitāṉ illai*) that will [redeem an apostate] and lead him on to the righteous path (*patitaṉaik katiyil uykkat*).

VERSE 193

pacuppaṭuttu iyākam paṇṇap puṇṇiyam āvatu eṉṟu
vacippilnāṉ maṟaikaḷ coṉṉa vaḷakkiṉāl vāymai yāka
nacippilā manti raṅkaḷ naviṟṟaliṉ iṉpam ākum
pacippuḷāṉ oruvaṉ uṇṇap paciyatu tīrnta paṇpē.

[This is the last verse in the discourse of the Bhaṭṭa Mīmāṁsika. "The Vedas declare the virtue in animal sacrifice. In the same vein, by chanting the age-old mantras one will experience immense joy just as a hungry man feels satiated

after eating food"].

TRANSLATION:

Just as following the tradition (*vaḻakkiṉāl*) of what the impeccable four Vedas have prescribed (*vacippil nāṉ maṟaikaḷ coṉṉa*)—that offering a cow in a sacrifice (*pacup paṭuttu iyākam paṇṇa*) will yield merit (*puṇṇiyam āvatu eṉṟu*)—[and that] by uttering (*naviṟṟaliṉ*) the sublime truths (*vāymai yāka*) of the everlasting mantras (*nacippilā mantiraṅkaḷ*) will yield pleasure (*iṉpam ākum*), [so too] a hungry person (*pacippuḷāṉ oruvaṉ*) feels [satiated] when he eats food (*uṇṇap*) and satisfies his hunger (*paciyatu tīrnta paṇpē*).

4.8B BHAṬṬA MĪMĀṀSĀ SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 194-203)

VERSE 194

vētam cuyampueṉa vētanta vāymoḻiyil vēṟumpira māṇam uḷatēl
nītantu kāṇiṅku mātuṅka pāratamum nērkaṇṭa tākum atupōl
ōtum colāyvaruta lāṉum kaṭātipaṭa mōvantiṭā oruvarā
lētanta tāmmaṟaika ḷāyvanta vāymoḻiyum vēṟuintu cēka raṉatē.

[Next, the Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his criticism of the Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṁsā school. "Except for your claim, there is no authoritative assertion that the Veda is uncaused. If there is any, show us now! Just as the *Mahābhārata* has an author, the Vedas must have an author. We infer this just as a potter makes a pot, and a weaver weaves a piece of cloth. We hold that the sacred words of the Vedas were revealed to us by Śiva"].

TRANSLATION:

You hold that the Vedas (*vētam*)[474] are uncaused [appeared on their own] (*cuyampu eṉa*), but there is no such declaration (*vāymoḻiyil*) in the Vedas (*vētanta*). [Furthermore], if there is another way of knowing (*vēṟum piramāṇam*

[474] Veda (in Sanskrit), *Vētam* (sing.), *Vētaṅkaḷ* (pl.) (in Tamil).

uḷatēl), let us know now (*nī tantu kāṇ iṅku*). The great *Mahābhārata* (*mātuṅka pāratamum*) is an example (*nērkaṇṭa tākum*). They [the Vedas] are composed by someone (*ōtum colāy varutalāṉum*) similar to [the *Mahābhārata*] (*atupōl*). Objects such as a pot or a piece of cloth (*kaṭāti paṭam*) cannot come about on their own (*vantiṭā oruvarā*). The sacred utterings (*vāymoḻiyum*) appearing as the Vedas (*maṟaikaḷāy vanta*) are from Cēkaraṉ [Śekhara, i.e., Śiva] (*cēkaraṉatē*) and they are given to us (*tantatām*).

VERSE 195

uraitanti ṭāṉ oruvaṉ eṉilinta vāṉiṉ iṭai olikoṇṭu mēvi uḷatām
puraitanta vāmmaṟaikaḷ apiveñca māyoḷirkai poruḷtanta tīpam atuvēl
varaitanta tāl ivvurai kapilaṉcol ākumatu maṟaikiṉṟa vāṟum varavum
viraiviṉ colāyitaṉai etukoṇṭu mēvuvatu viṭaikoṇṭatāl uṉuraiyē.

["If you say that no one authored the Vedas, then they must have appeared from the sky as meaningless gibberish, if so, they will be faulty. If you claim that the Vedas spread their knowledge just as a lamp that shows its brightness and at the same time brightens its surroundings, the brightness can have only a limited range; hence the Vedas must have limited knowledge. You are repeating what sage Kapila had proclaimed.[475] Does it have a beginning and an end as he claims? How could you prove that the Vedas are with form sometimes and without form some other times? Explain the basis of your opinion, because what you say makes no sense"].

TRANSLATION:

If no one authored [the Vedas] (*uraitantiṭāṉ oruvaṉ eṉil*), it means that they appeared (*mēvi uḷatām*) from the sky as mere [meaningless] sound (*inta vāṉiṉ*

[475] Sage Kapila (Kapilaṉ in Tamil) (fl. circa 800 BCE?) - a legendary seer said to have founded the Sāṁkhya system of thought.

iṭai olikoṇṭu). If so, the Vedas are faulty (*purai tantavām maṟaikaḷ*). If you say that just as a lamp (*tīpam atuvēl*), which, besides manifesting its brightness (*apiveñcamāy*), sheds light on objects (*oḷirkai poruḷtanta*), [but the brightness spreads only within a limited range], when the limitation of your words [analogy] (*varai tantatāl ivvurai*) is similar to the words of Kapilaṉ [Kapila] (*kapilaṉ col ākum*). Explain quickly (*viraiviṉ colāy*) the form and formless nature of the Vedas (*atu maṟaikiṉṟa vāṟum varavum*) and on what are your views based (*itaṉai etukoṇṭu mēvuvatu*), because your words do not seem to address the issue (*viṭai koṇṭatāl uṉ uraiyē*).

VERSE 196

uruviṉ kaṇēmaruvi variliṉṟu tērar urai uḷatuuṅkaḷ nūliṉ maṟaiyum
tarukiṉṟa nātar avar ivareṉṟu nāmamatu taravantiṭāmai ataṉāl
varumeṉṟu nēṭiyeṉil vaḷarkiṉṟa tīvataṉil varukiṉṟa āṭai palavāl
orutantu vāyaṉ avaṉ ivaṉeṉṟa pōtil ivaiuḷa eṉṟu nīṭi yavaiyē.

["You say that the Vedas are revealed by getting united with a person. According to you, even a frog's croak may utter your Vedas. You claim Vedas will seek an author, but the author is not perceived. This is similar to claiming that there is no maker of the cloth imported from an island, because the maker is not perceived"].

TRANSLATION:

[You say that the Vedas are revealed by] entering the body of a person (*uruviṉ kaṇē maruvivaril*). [If so], the Vedas described by you (*iṉṟu uṅkaḷ nūliṉ maṟaiyum*) could be born in the croaking of a frog (*tērar urai uḷatu*). Without providing (*taravantiṭāmai*) a specific name (*nāmamatu*) of the author (*tarukiṉṟa nātar*) as to this person or that person (*avar ivar eṉṟu*), you say that [the Vedas] will seek someone to be its author (*ataṉāl varum eṉṟu nēṭiyeṉil*). From the many garments (*āṭai palavāl*) received (*varukiṉṟa*) from the islands that [trade] many articles of merchandise (*vaḷarkiṉṟa tīvataṉil*), even not knowing the weaver (*oru tantuvāyaṉ*), either this one or that one (*avaṉ ivaṉ eṉṟa pōtil*), we can infer (*nīṭi*

yavaiyē) the existence of one (*ivaiuḷa eṉṟu*).

VERSE 197

maṟainiṉṟu nāluticai yavaroṉṟa tākavarum uraitanta vāymai ataṉāl
niṟaiveṉṟu nīṭumeṉil vaṉaiyum kaṭātipala colavoṉṟi nīṭi uḷatām
kuṟaiviṉṟi nāṭummoḻi avaiceṉṟu kūṭuvator kuṇamuṇṭatu ākum
malartāṉ
uṟaikiṉṟa mālaitaṉil uḷateṉṟatu ākumeṉil uṇarviṉṟatu āḻi oliyē.

["Even people scattered across different countries in four directions, speaking several tongues, believe in the veracity of the four Vedas. Therefore, you may suggest that it was not composed by one person and must be uncaused. Your argument is not tenable because even if pots are made in different countries, it does not negate the fact that a potter is required to make a pot. You claim that a faultless chanting of the Vedas will bring happiness. This is akin to saying that flowers acquire fragrance after they are made into a garland. Your words are like the meaningless roar of the ocean].

TRANSLATION:

The fact that (*ataṉāl*) [people living apart] in four different directions (*nāluticai yavar*) still follow the [Vedic] instructions (*uraitanta*) as sublime truths (*vāymai*) and as a sole authority (*oṉṟatāka varum*) confirms (*eṉil*) that the Vedas (*maṟai*) are eternal (*niṟaiveṉṟu nīṭum*). Several pots (*vaṉaiyum kaṭātipala*) made by potters have their differences (*niṟaiveṉṟu nīṭumeṉil*). [However, to produce a pot, a potter is required]. Similarly, to unite the words (*colavoṉṟi*) and their meaning (*nāṭummoḻi*) in the Vedas without a fault (*kuṟaiviṉṟi*), we need an agent [creator] (*kūṭuvator*) with superior quality (*kuṇamuṇṭatu ākum*) to assemble them (*avaiceṉṟu*). If you say that it is just like flowers (*malartāṉ*) acquire their fragrance (*uḷateṉṟatu ākumeṉil*) after becoming a part of a garland (*uṟaikiṉṟa mālaitaṉil*), your words are akin to the meaningless (*uṇarviṉṟatu*) roar of the ocean (*āḻi oliyē*).

VERSE 198

uṭalniṉṟu nāmuṇarum atukaṇṭa vāṟu oruvaṉ ulakaṅkaḷē uruvamāy
iṭainiṉṟu māmaṟaikaḷ avai aṉṟu vāymoḻiya ivaikoṇṭu lōka neṟiyiṉ
kaṭaṉṉiṉṟu vāḻumatu karutumpiṉ āṇaivaḻi karumamcey kāciṉi yuḷor
tiṭameṉṟu cīr aracaṉ uraitaṅkum ōlaitiru mukam eṉṟu cūṭu ceyalē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin holds that just as the human soul is attached to the body, god treats the universe as his body and has revealed the Vedas to us. Just as the subjects of a king prize a letter from him, which they carry as an adornment, god's utterances (of the Vedas) are revered and prized by us].

TRANSLATION:

[Our souls are] attached to our body (*uṭalniṉṟu*), and we experience consciousness [through our body] (*nām uṇarum*). Similarly (*atukaṇṭa vāṟu*), a creator (*oruvaṉ*) dwelling in the universe as his body (*ulakaṅkaḷē uruvamāy iṭainiṉṟu*), uttered (*vāymoḻiya*) the great Vedas (*māmaṟaikaḷ avai*). Based on these sayings (*ivaikoṇṭu*), the universe concentrates (*karutum*) on the prescriptions (*lōka neṟiyiṉ*) and follows the directions (*kaṭaṉniṉṟu vāḻum*). Worldly people [subjects] (*kāciṉiyuḷor*) who follow the royal injunctions (*āṇaivaḻi karumamcey*) with certainty (*tiṭameṉṟu*), bundle up (*cūṭu ceyalē*) the sheaves of the letter [palm leaves] carrying the king's words (*aracaṉ uraitaṅkum ōlai*) and adorn their heads with them (*tiru mukam eṉṟu*).

VERSE 199

muṭiviṉṟi vētiyarkaḷ mutalvanta mūvarkaḷum moḻiyumcol āriyam eṉil
kaṭiviṉṟi yēkaṇitar avarkaṇṭa vāṟatuveṉ vaṭakaṇṭa cāti kaṭiyā
ōṭiviṉṟi ōtuvatueṉ uraitaṅku vētamoḻi uḷateṉṟu kūṟum avartām
aṭiyiṉṟi tāṉ eṉum atu aṟiviṉṟi īṉumavar ilaiyeṉṟa ātara vatē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin takes a strong position on the equality of people of all

castes. “You say that the Vedas are meant only for the first three castes.[476] Then how do you explain the mastery of the fourth caste over the art of astrology without knowing the language of the Vedas?[477] Why is there no caste restriction in the northern part of India?[478] If you say that the Vedas have the nature of sound and are without authors is as inane as saying a born person has no mother”].

TRANSLATION:

You say conclusively (*muṭiviṉṟi*) that the practitioners of the Vedas (*vētiyarkaḷ*) are the first three castes (*mutalvanta mūvarkaḷum*) and their language is Sanskrit (*moḻiyumcol āriyam eṉil*). [If so], without any restraint (*kaṭiviṉṟiyē*), how did the astrologers (*kaṇitar*) learn [their craft] (*avarkaṇṭa vāṟatuveṉ*)? In the northern part of the country, (*vaṭakaṇṭa*) where the caste system is not observed (*cāti kaṭiyā*), everyone without any exclusion (*ōṭiviṉṟi*) can recite the Vedas (*ōtuvatueṉ*). To say that (*kūṟum avartām*) the Vedas contain everything in themselves (*vētamoḻi uḷateṉṟu*) and such is the nature of sound (*uraitaṅku*) and to say that they do not have any origin (*aṭiyiṉṟi tāṉ eṉum atu*) is being senseless (*aṟiviṉṟi*) and [is like] saying (*ātaravatē*) [that persons born] do not have a mother (*īṉumavar ilai*).

VERSE 200

aṟikiṉṟa pāṉmai avayavam niṉṟa tākil aṇu aḻiyum kaṭāti eṉavē
ceṟikiṉṟa vāṟatu ilai eṉiṉvantu cerumatu tiṭamaṉṟu kūṭa oruvaṉ
kuṟikoṇṭu kāriṉmuḷai varukiṉṟa pīcam avai kulaiyoṉṟi vēṉil aḻiyum
uṟukiṉṟa kālamavai uṭaṉniṉṟu pōyaḻiyum ulakeṉṟum nīṭi yilatē.

---

[476] The first three castes are Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, and Vaiśya (in Sanskrit); Pirāmaṇaṉ, Cattiriyaṉ, and Vaiciyaṉ (in Tamil).

[477] Astrology is one of the six auxiliary texts of the Vedas. See verse 185. Astrologers do not belong to the first three castes. MUTALIAR 1910:301.

[478] Unlike the case in South India, in northern part of India all castes are allowed to recite the Vedas.

[If you say that the intelligent soul is attached to the body, then when the body is destroyed, the soul will be destroyed with it. Besides, the body has no intelligence to be able to unite with the soul. Hence, it is obvious that there must be a creator who could facilitate such a union. Just as the sprouts that are born out of seeds during rainy season, perish during the hot weather, all created beings die. Therefore, the universe undergoes creation, preservation, and dissolution. It is not eternal].

TRANSLATION:

If the intelligent soul (*aṟikiṉṟa aṇu*) unites with (*niṉṟatākil*) and assumes the nature of a body (*avayavam pāṉmai*), which has parts similar to a pot and such (*kaṭāti*), then it will perish (*aḻiyum eṉavē*) [with the body]. If you say that the soul does not seek [the body and its organs] (*ceṟikiṉṟa vāṟatu ilai*), [but the organs] seek and unite with the soul (*eṉiṉvantu cerumatu*), then it needs a strong one (*tiṭamaṉṟu oruvaṉ*) with a specific goal (*kuṟikoṇṭu*) to unite them (*kūṭa*). During the rainy season, the sprouts appear (*kāriṉmuḷai varukiṉṟa*) from the seed (*pīcam*) and dry out and perish (*avai kulaiyoṉṟi aḻiyum*) in the hot season (*vēṉil*). [Similarly] being part of (*uṭaṉniṉṟu*) evolving time (*uṟukiṉṟa kālamavai*),[479] the world will perish (*ulakeṉṟum pōyaḻiyum*). It is not eternal (*nīṭi yilatē*).

VERSE 201

niṟaiveṅku mākil uyir neṟiniṉṟu pōyvarutal aṇaiviṉṟa tām uṭalilē
kuṟaiviṉṟu elāmumuḷa kuṭakanta mākil avai viṭaniṉṟa vāṟu kuṟiyā
uṟaikiṉṟa mātavarkaḷ uṭalniṉṟu pōyvaṟitor uṭalkoṇṭu mīḷvatu uṇarāy
maṟaitanta vāymaiyatil niṟaiviṉṟi yē ulakiṉ malaikiṉṟa tāl uṉ uraiyē.

["If you say that the soul is all pervading, then it cannot follow the virtuous path to reach the heaven and come back again. If you say, the soul inhabits the body

[479] The "evolving time" refers to the three phases of creation, sustenance, and dissolution. MUTALIAR 1910:303.

just as the fragrance of a flower is contained inside a pot, then along with the body the soul should also decay. Furthermore, if the soul is all pervasive, then it cannot transmigrate. Because you have not clearly understood the Vedas, you are confused"].

TRANSLATION:

If souls (*uyir*) are all-pervading (*niṟaiveṅkum ākil*), [your view that] following their righteous acts (*neṟiniṉṟu*), [souls] go to heaven (*pōy*) and return (*varutal*) [after the exhaustion of their merits] is not supported (*aṇaiviṉṟatām*). If you say they (*elāmum*) are contained inside bodies (*uṭalilē*) similar to the fragrance of flowers (*kuṭakanta*) that fill the inside of a pot (*kuṟaiviṉṟu uḷa mākil*), [then] when bodies perish, souls will be lost (*avai viṭaniṉṟa vāṟu kuṟiyā*). You know that (*uṇarāy*) some yogic mystics (*uṟaikiṉṟa mātavarkaḷ*) leave their bodies behind (*uṭalniṉṟu pōy*) and enter other bodies (*aṟitor uṭalkoṇṭu mīḷvatu*). Because you have not fully understood (*niṟaiviṉṟi yē*) the sublime teachings of the Vedas (*maṟaitanta vāymaiyatil*), your words are confused (*malaikiṉṟatāl uṉ uraiyē*).

VERSE 202

aḻikiṉṟa tālviṇaikaḷ ākiṉṟa vāṟueṉeru atumaṅki yāṉa paricēl
oḻiviṉṟi ōtaṉamum aṟavuṇṇa nāmviṇaikaḷ uṟukiṉṟa vāṟatu eṉalām
kaḻikiṉṟa tālaṟivu viṇaitan tiṭāviṇaiñar karumaṅkaḷ nāṭi uṟuvōr
paḻutiṉṟi yēutavum atupaṇpa tāka aruḷ paramaṉ kaṇ ākum viṇaiyē.

[It is difficult to conceive that one's past actions accompany the soul for future births because the actions performed by one perish with the body. The analogy of the manure provided by the protagonist is not valid because the actions in one life cannot be united to the body in a future birth. Śiva metes out the karmic effects just as an employer hands out wages depending on one's labor"].

TRANSLATION:

You hold that when a body perishes (*aḻikiṉṟa tāl*), its karma will perish with it

(*viṉaikaḷ ākiṉṟa vāṟueṉ*), [but it reappears, just as does] the rotting manure (*atu maṅki yāṉa eru*) which offers benefits [to the crops] (*paricēl*); then, we can say (*eṉalām*) that food eaten every day (*ōtaṉamum aṟavuṇṇa*) is excreted (*oḻiviṉṟi*), and it can again produce food (*nāmviṉaikaḷ uṟukiṉṟa vāṟatu*). When the body dies (*kaḻikiṉṟatāl*), karma (*viṉai*) [dies with it, and so] cannot have the knowledge [to unite with the soul] (*aṟivu tantiṭā*). Just as it is customary (*atu paṇpatāka*) for the employer (*uṟuvōr*) to pay wages without default (*paḻutiṉṟiyē utavum*) to the laborer [according to the work performed] (*viṉaiñar*) who seeks work (*karumaṅkaḷ nāṭi*), [so too] the benevolent Śiva (*kaṇ paramaṉ*) graces karma to bear fruit (*aruḷ ākum viṉaiyē*).

VERSE 203

karumaṅkaḷ ñāṉamatu uṭaṉniṉṟa lālmaruva katitaṅkal āvatu eṉiṉnī
tarumaṅka rākamutal avaitaṅka mēlaṟivu tavirumpiṉ vīṭum aṇaiyā
poruḷniṉṟu tēṭivaru payaṉuṇṭu pōkaviṉai purikiṉṟa vāṟatu eṉavē
tiruniṉṟa pōkamvaḷar aviceṉṟu mēviyatu celavuṇṭu cūḻva ceyalē.

[Just as one enjoys pleasure by accumulating wealth that will provide incentive to strive for more wealth, the desire to perform austerities to attain salvation will induce one to get more entangled in carrying out rituals].

TRANSLATION:

You hold that (*eṉiṉ nī*) by performing austerities (*karumaṅkaḷ uṭaṉ niṉṟalāl*) along with knowledge [of the Vedas] (*ñāṉamatu*), one will prevent future births [attain salvation] (*maruva katitaṅkal āvatu*). [Desire to perform austerities] will induce more desire [for wealth] (*tarum aṅka rāka mutal*), which, in turn, will prevent one from acquiring higher knowledge (*avaitaṅka mēlaṟivu tavirum*), and so there will be no salvation (*piṉ vīṭum aṇaiyā*). Just as (*eṉavē*) acquiring wealth (*poruḷniṉṟu tēṭi*) and enjoying its benefits [pleasures] (*payaṉ uṇṭu*) will tempt one to acquire more wealth (*pōkaviṉai purikiṉṟa vāṟatu*), [so] the desire to perform sacrifices (*vaḷar aviceṉṟu*) to attain heaven (*tiruniṉṟa pōkam mēviyatu*) will only force one

to be entangled [in performing more austerities] (*celavuṇṭu cūḻva ceyalē*).

4.9A PRĀBHĀKARA MĪMĀṁSĀ SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 204-205)

VERSE 204

aruntavaṉām caimiṉipaṇṭu āraṇanūl āyntāṉāyt
tiruntumula kiṉiṟkoṇṭu ceppiyanūl tiṟamataṉaip
parintupira pākaraṉ paṭṭācāṉil vēṟākip
purintuuraicey neṟiyataṉaip puvaṉimicaip pukaṉṟiṭuvām.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his discourse as the protagonist of the Prābhākara school of Mīmāṁsā.[480] As an introduction, he states that there are differences between Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (Paṭṭāccāriyaṉ) and Prabhākara (Pirapākaraṉ) in their interpretation of Jaimini (Caimiṉi), the founder of the Mīmāṁsā school].

Pirapākaraṉ [Prabhākara] (*pirapākaraṉ*) studied the treatises [based on the Vedas] (*āraṇanūl āyntāṉāy*) of Caimiṉi [Jaimini] who is renowned for his austerities and knowledge (*aruntavaṉām caimiṉi paṇṭu*). He understands the doctrines (*tiṟamataṉaip parintu*) in the treatise (*ceppiya nūl*) composed for the betterment of humankind (*tiruntum ulakiṉiṟ koṇṭu*), and he differs from Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (*paṭṭācāṉil vēṟāki*). Let us extol (*pukaṉṟiṭuvām*) the eminence (*micai*) of his [Prabhākara's] righteous teachings (*purintuuraicey neṟiyataṉai*) on this earth (*puvaṉi*).

VERSE 205

aruñceyaliṉ apāvattē apūrvam eṉumatu tōṉṟit
taruñceyalniṉṟu aḻiyilpiṉ palippippatu ākumatu
varuñceyal oṉṟu iṉṟiyē maṇcilaipō lāmmuttit

---

[480] The Prābhākara school of Mīmāṁsā is named after its founder Prabhākara. See footnote under verse 181.

taruñceyal ītu eṉavuṇarntu tāraṇimēl avaṉcāṟṟum.

[The concepts of *apūrva* and *mukti*[481] of the Prābhākara school are presented].

TRANSLATION:

In appraising [the karma of] past actions [of a soul] (*aruñceyaliṉ apāvattē*), *apūrva* appears (*apūrvam eṉumatu tōṉṟi*).[482] It participates in the expiation and exhaustion [of karma] (*taruñceyalniṉṟu aḻiyil*) and makes itself operative (*piṉ palippippatu ākumatu*) in reaching a state free from any actions (*varuñceyal oṉṟu iṉṟiyē*). The state of salvation (*muttit taruñceyal*) is an inert state similar to that of sand and stone (*maṇcilai pōlām*). This should be understood on this earth (*ītu eṉavuṇarntu tāraṇimēl*). These are his words (*avaṉcāṟṟum*).

4.9B PRĀBHĀKARA MĪMĀṀSĀ SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 206-207)

VERSE 206

vēṟupalaṉ taruvatutāṉ viṉaiyeṉṟu vētaṅkaḷ
kūṟuvōr apūrvamtāṉ koṭukkumeṉak koṇṭa urai
māṟutarum maṟaiyōṭu muṉpiṉṟi vantatāl
tēṟiyaviṇ pūmēṭimēl cērntumaṇantu ikaḻntatuvām.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his criticism of the Prābhākara school. "The views of Prabhākara are in opposition to Vedic injunctions. To suggest that the fruits of karma are due to *apūrva,* and not due to the past karma, defying Vedic authority, is similar to suggesting that flowers picked from the sky get their fragrance when they adorn something"].

---

[481] The Tamil equivalents are *apūrvam* and *mutti*.

[482] Prabhākara considers that the fruits of good and bad actions of the past are attached to the soul by an unseen power called *apūrva.* It is a mysterious, transcendent power produced by a correctly performed sacrificial ritual, not through the action of gods. It is considered either as the imperceptible antecedent of the fruit, or as the after-state of the act. See RADHAKRISHNAN 1989:421-422.

TRANSLATION:

The Vedas state (*vētaṅkaḷ kūṟu*) that souls experience (*vēṟupalaṉ taruvatutāṉ*) past karmic impressions [in this birth] (*viṉaiyeṉṟu*). Your words that (*koṇṭa urai*) *apūrva* will facilitate this (*apūrvamtāṉ koṭukkum eṉa*) is contrary to what the Vedas declare (*māṟutarum maṟaiyōṭu*). If [the fruits of past karma] mature newly [from *apūrva*] (*muṉpiṉṟi vantatāl*), [it is similar to saying that] the flower from the sky without any fragrance (*tēṟiya viṇ pū*) gets its fragrance (*cērntu maṇantu*) when placed on the head [i.e. adorns the head] (*muṭimēl atuvām*).

VERSE 207

āṉantam katiyeṉṉa aṟivu aḻikai vīṭueṉkai
ūṉampiṉa uṇarvaḻintōrkku uḷatākum uyarmutti
tāṉiṅkuc civappoḻiyat taḻalniṟkum āṟillai
ñāṉaṅkeṭṭu uyirniṟkum eṉum uraitāṉ naṇṇātāl.

[Contrary to what the Vedas claim about the nature of liberation, Prabhākara asserts that destruction of intelligence and becoming inert like stone and sand is the ultimate liberation. Should this be the case, then when one loses consciousness, one will attain liberation! Aruṇanti points out that such a view are not acceptable].

TRANSLATION:

[The Vedas] equate bliss with liberation (*āṉantam katiyeṉṉa*), but you hold that obliteration of intelligence (*aṟivu aḻikai*) and being inert [as a stone] (*ūṉam*) is liberation (*vīṭu eṉkai*). If that is so (*piṉ*), those who lose consciousness (*uṇarvu aḻintōrkku*) should realize (*uḷatākum*) the great liberation (*uyarmutti*), [just as] when fire (taḻal) loses its nature of red color (*tāṉiṅkuc civappoḻiya*), it cannot be sustained (*niṟkum āṟillai*). Your words—that the soul can live (*uyir niṟkum eṉum uraitāṉ*) without intelligence (*ñāṉaṅkeṭṭu*)—are not acceptable (*naṇṇātāl*).

4.10A ŚABDA BRAHMAVĀDA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 208-211)

VERSE 208

uraiyā ṉatumai yaliṉāl ulakām
puraiyōr uṇarum poruḷpoy itaṉai
viraiyātu uṇarum atuvīṭu eṉavē
varaiyātu uraivā tivakut taṉaṉē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin initiates his discourse as the protagonist of the school belonging to the Śabda Brahmavādins.[483] According to the tenets of this school, *śabda* or sound is the governing principle of the universe. The school refutes the ignorant claim that meaning is different from the sound].

TRANSLATION:

Sound appeared (*uraiyāṉatu*) as the universe (*ulakām*) because of delusion (*maiyaliṉāl*); what the ignorant ones claim (*puraiyōr uṇarum*) is false (*poruḷ poy*); realizing the falsity of such a claim (*itaṉai viraiyātu uṇarum*) [of the ignorant ones] is true salvation (*atuvīṭu eṉavē*). The proponent (*uraivāti*) has narrated categorically (*vakuttaṉaṉē*) the limitless nature [of sound] (*varaiyātu*).

VERSE 209

pariṇā mamvivart taṉammā yam atil
tarumamām ulakuḷ ḷatucat tamatē
poruḷā vatucol nalamal laveṉiṉ
maruvā tuporuḷ tiṟammaṟṟu ilaiyē.

["As all the objects of the universe are emanations of sound only, if the objects

---

[483] According to the grammarian Bhartṛhari (fl. 5th century CE), Śabdabrahman (Cattappiramaṉ in Tamil) is the single principle and ultimate reality out of which the entire universe has evolved. Language and the universe it refers to are, therefore one, an indivisible whole. See JOHNSON 2009:55.

are not identical with the words, the protagonist questions, how is it possible for words to acquire meaning?"].

TRANSLATION:

Delusion (*māyam*) causes the evolution and illusory appearance (*pariṇāmam vivarttaṉam*) of this universe (*atil tarumamām ulaku*); [what is contained in this universe] is sound (*atu cattamatē*); what is called meaning is the result of sound (*poruḷāvatu col nalam*). If you disagree (*allaveṉiṉ*), no meaning can exist without sound (*maruvā tuporuḷ tiṟammaṟṟu ilaiyē*).

VERSE 210

pūmā eṉavē uraiyum poruḷum
āmām poruḷ oṉṟil aṇaintu ilatāl
nām ātaraveytu colnaṉ karuvāyt
tāmām poruḷneṟ poritāṉ eṉavē.

["A word and its meaning are tied to each other. Just as rice could be seen in different forms, so could a word have several meanings"].

TRANSLATION:

[The two words] "*pū*" and "*mā*" (*pūmā*) mean (*uraiyum*) [two different] objects (*poruḷum*). Because the word and its meaning are not fused together (*āmām poruḷ oṉṟil aṇaintu ilatāl*), [when we speak] the word lovingly (*nām ātaraveytu col*), the meaning of different objects (*tāmām poruḷ*) is born (*karuvāy*). It is similar to rice becoming puffed rice (*neṟ poritāṉ eṉavē*).

VERSE 211

colvantu eḻalum poruḷtōṉ ṟutalāl
collē poruḷ eṉṟu tuṇintiṭum nī
collum poruḷum uṭaṉniṉ ṟateṉiṉ
collum poruḷ iṉṟu colniṉ ṟatuvē.

[The Śabda Brahmavādin objects the suggestion that a word and its meaning are successive. Should that be the case, we would have a ludicrous condition when a word can exist independent of its meaning].

TRANSLATION:

The meaning of a word is understood (*poruḷ tōṉṟutalāl*) [immediately] after it is spoken (*colvantu eḻalum*); thus, it is established that the word is identical with its meaning (*collē poruḷ eṉṟu tuṇintiṭum*). If you say that the word and its meaning appear jointly (*collum poruḷum uṭaṉ niṉṟateṉiṉ*), then, when you give the meaning of a word (*collum poruḷ*), you [have to] use [another] word (*colniṉṟatuvē*).

4.10B ŚABDA BRAHMAVĀDA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 212-219)

VERSE 212

uraiyā ṉatumai yaliṉāl ulakēl
uraiyāy orumai yalumuḷ ḷateṉa
varaiyātu uṇarum atuvaṇ katiyēl
varaiyā maṟaiyōṭu malain taṉaiyē.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his criticism of the Brahmavādin. "Your view that *śabda* as a reality is itself the final salvation conflict with the teachings of the Vedas that performance of austerities and accumulation of knowledge alone will result in salvation].

TRANSLATION:

If you state that [words] sounds (*uraiyāṉatu*) are created in the world (*ulakēl*) due to delusion (*maiyaliṉāl*), then even such a statement should be [treated as stated] as delusion (*uraiyāy oru maiyalum uḷḷateṉa*). If believing in sound as a reality is itself salvation (*varaiyātu uṇarum atuvaṇ katiyēl*), then you are in discord (*malain taṉaiyē*) with Vedic prescriptions (*varaiyā maṟaiyōṭu*).

VERSE 213

aruvam uraiyā taliṉ av vuruvāy
maruvum pariṇā mammaṟan tiṭumām
parukum tatiyāṉatu pālatu eṉil
uruvam atuvāy aḻiyum uraiyē.

["You hold that although sound is formless, it manifests itself as words. If you suggest that just as liquid milk could change into solid curds, formless sound could manifest itself as worldly objects, then just as curds could not become milk again, the world could not be reduced back to sound. Your *śabda* will perish"].

TRANSLATION:

Because words do not have a form (*aruvam uraiyā taliṉ*), and as they are transformed in this world by evolution (*av vuruvāy maruvum pariṇāmam*), they will lose their meaning [in the process] (*maṟantiṭumām*). Just as the curds could not be reversed back to milk] (*parukum tatiyāṉatu pālatu eṉil*), [the evolved forms could not be reversed back to sound and the] evolved forms would perish (*uruvam atuvāy aḻiyum uraiyē*).

VERSE 214

āyam uṭaṉ antavivart taṉamum
māyav vuḻateṉ ṟucol evviṭamum
āyniṉ ṟamaiyiṉ uraiyiṉ nalamum
āyum poruḻukku aṟinā mamatē.

["Words are just labels to identify objects and are not identical with them"].

TRANSLATION:

You must agree (*eṉṟu col*) that the illusory appearances [of the world] (*vivarttaṉa mum*) along with sound (*āyam uṭaṉ anta*) are perishable (*māya vuḻatu*). The substances determined by sound [words] are everywhere (*evviṭamum āy niṉṟamaiyiṉ*), and words (*uraiyiṉ nalamum*) become mere labels (*nāmam atē*) of

things (*poruḷukku*) when we desire to know them (*āyum aṟi*).

VERSE 215

uraipōl poruḷukku uruviṉ maiyiṉ av
uraiyē poruḷ eṉ ṟaṉai iṉṟu ariyeṉ
uraiyē kavimā lavaṉukku uḷatām
uraiyāy kaviyā kavormā viṉaiyē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin reiterates that *śabda* and its meaning are different. Even though a word and its meaning appear together they have to be distinguished as separate].

TRANSLATION:

Just as a word [has no form] (*uraipōl*), its meaning has no form (*poruḷukku uruviṉmaiyiṉ*). If you say that the word and its meaning are the same (*uraiyē poruḷ eṉ ṟaṉai*), it is not so (*iṉṟu*), because the word Ari (*ariyeṉ uraiyē*) refers (*uḷatām*) to Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*) [as well as to] a monkey (*kavi*). Could Māl be called a monkey (*kaviyākavormā*) because the word has two meanings (*uraiyāy viṉaiyē*)?

VERSE 216

nellil poriyā vatunīṭu aḻalil
collil poruḷ oṉ ṟoṭutok kiṭalāl
kalvit tiṟamām uraikāṭ ciyiṉāl
mallal poruḷcā lavaḷam tarumē.

["Understanding clearly that a word could have several meanings would be very beneficial"].

TRANSLATION:

You say that just as rice becomes puffed rice (*nellil poriyāvatu*) because of fire

[so too, the word becomes meaning] (*nīṭu aḻalil*). Because a word (*collil*) has a collection of [several] meanings (*poruḷ oṉṟoṭu tokkiṭalāl*), learning to know the meaning by recognition (*kāṭciyiṉāl*) is the knowledge of sound (*kalvit tiṟamām urai*). The knowledge of meaning (*poruḷ*) will offer (*mallal tarumē*) very many more benefits [than just the sound] (*cālavaḻam*).

VERSE 217

muṅkaṇ ṭaporuḷ peyar ātaliṉāl
piṉkaṇ ṭapiḻampu uṇarum peyarāl
naṉkaṇ ṭaporuṭku orunā camatiṉṟu
eṉkaṇ ṭaṉaikāraṇam iṉṟu aḻivē.

[The meaning of a word is more important than just the *śabda*. Sound will perish, but not the meaning].

TRANSLATION:

The name we know (*peyar ātaliṉāl*) is that of an object we have seen already (*muṅkaṇ ṭaporuḷ*). We recognize some objects [later] (*piṉkaṇṭa piḻampu*) because we know the name (*uṇarum peyarāl*). The meaning of the object (*naṉkaṇṭa poruṭku*) does not perish (*oru nācam atiṉṟu*); only the sound carrying it perishes (*eṉkaṇ ṭaṉaikāraṇam iṉṟu aḻivē*).

VERSE 218

poruḷin tiriyam uṇarvō ṭupumāṉ
iruḷiṉ ṟiyuṭum oḷi ittaṉaiyum
maruvum poḻutil varuñā ṉamatiṉ
oruvum peyar arttam utittiṭumē.

["The knowledge/object perceived is more important than the *śabda*"].

TRANSLATION:

[The soul acquires] knowledge of an object (*varu ñāṉam*) when the known object

(*poruḷ*), internal and external organs (*intiriyam*), consciousness (*uṇarvu*), and light that removes darkness (*iruḷiṉṟiyuṭum oḷi*) come together (*ittaṉaiyum maruvum poḻutil*). In such a perception, there is no name (*oruvum peyar*), but only the meaning [knowledge] of the object arises (*atiṉ arttam utittiṭumē*).

VERSE 219

arttam teḷitaṟku oḷiyā ṉatupōl
cattam poruḷtāṉ aṟitaṟku uḷatām
nittam atuvaṉṟu uraiṉiṉṟu aḻiyum
cittaṉ oruvaṉ uraicey taṉaṉē.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin concludes his criticism of the Śabda Brahmavādins. "Just as a lamp is required to reveal an object in darkness, *śabda* is required to know the different objects. It is inappropriate to say that *śabda* is formless, and then claim the formless *śabda* to be Brahman. Moreover, it is Śiva who created *śabda*"].

TRANSLATION:

Just as a lamp helps (*oḷiyāṉatu pōl*) in discerning [objects in the dark] (*arttam teḷitaṟku*), sound (*cattam*) is required to understand various objects (*poruḷtāṉ aṟitaṟku uḷatām*). [However], it is not eternal (*nittam atuvaṉṟu*) and is subject to annihilation (*urai niṉṟu aḻiyum*). This has been expounded (*uraicey taṉaṉē*) by an accomplished mystic [Śiva] (*cittaṉ oruvaṉ*).

4.11A MĀYĀVĀDA (ADVAITIN) SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 220-234)

VERSE 220

nāṉē piramam eṉṟuraittu ñālam pēyttēr eṉa eṇṇi
ūṉē pukuntu niṉṟu uyirkaṭku upatēcaṅkaḷ uraittuvarum
māṉā matikē ṭaṉumāya māyāvāti pēyākit
tāṉē uraikkum annūliṉ uṇmai taṉṉaic cāṟṟuvām.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin initiates his discourse as the protagonist of the Māyāvādin.[484] He begins with the equation that self is identical with Brahman (Piramam in Tamil) and the basic tenet of the school that the phenomenal world is illusory. Of all the schools addressed by Aruṇanti, the most acerbic tone with harsh comments can be seen in his analysis of the Māyāvāda school].

TRANSLATION:

The shameless (*māṉā*) devilish (*pēyāki*) Māyāvādin, with an impaired intellect (*matikē ṭaṉumāya māyāvāti*), declares himself to be Brahman (*nāṉē piramam eṉṟuraittu*) and considers the whole word to be a mirage (*ñālam pēyttēr eṉa eṇṇi*). He enters a physical body (*ūṉē pukuntu niṉṟu*), and imparts his teaching to humanity (*uyirkaṭku upatēcaṅkaḷ uraittuvarum*). Let us explain [examine] the truth [principles] (*uṇmai taṉṉaic*) explained by him in his treatise (*tāṉē uraikkum annūliṉ cāṟṟuvām*).

VERSE 221

aṟivāy akila kāraṇamāy aṉantā ṉantamāy aruvāyc
ceṟivāy eṅkum nittamāyt tikaḻnta cattāyc cuttamatāyk
kuṟitāṉ kuṇaṅkaḷ oṉṟiṉṟik kūṟum vētam taṉakku aḷavāyp
piṟiyā aṉupū tikamtaṉakkāy niṉṟatu antap piramamtāṉ.

[Brahman's impeccable attributes are listed].

TRANSLATION:

[According to him, god] is [cosmic] intelligence (*aṟivu*), first-cause (*akila kāraṇam*), limitless bliss (*aṉantāṉantam*), formless (*aruvu*), all-merciful (*ceṟivaṉ*), omnipresent (*eṅkum*), eternal (*nittam*), faultlessly shining (*tikaḻnta*), true (*cattu*),

[484] Aruṇanti labels Śaṅkarācārya's philosophy of Ekātmavāda (Ēkātmavātam in Tamil) as Māyāvāda (Māyāvātam in Tamil). See MUTTAPPAN 2003:157. Also known as Atvaita Vētāntam (Advaita Vedānta in Sanskrit). "Ekātman" (Sanskrit) refers to the doctrine of one universal spirit. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Monier-Williams. s.v. "Ekātman" (p. 230)*.

and pure (*cuttam*). It is that Brahman (*antap piramam*) who is devoid of any identification (*kuṟi*) or qualities (*kuṇaṅkaḷ*), who is the measure of the Vedas (*vētam taṉakku aḷavāy*) with inexhaustible perception (*aṉupūtikam*), [and] who has [other] such attributes (*taṉakkāy niṉṟatu*).

VERSE 222

oṉṟām iravi palapāṇṭattu uṇṭām utakattu aṅkaṅkē
niṉṟāṟ pōla uṭaltōṟum nikaḻntu niṟkum poruḷmēṟkaṇ
ceṉṟāṟ pōlap pulaṉkaḷukkum cintai taṉakkum terivaritām
eṉṟāl kāṭci mutalāya irumūṉṟu aḷavaikku eṭṭātāl.

[This verse emphasizes that all souls are projections of the one and only Brahman. There could be many reflections of the sun in several vessels holding water, but there is only one sun. Similarly, Brahman appears as many in different bodies. Just as the sun cannot be contained in the vessel, the bodies cannot know Brahman, which transcends consciousness and knowledge. It is difficult to grasp Brahman through the six ways of knowing[485]].

TRANSLATION:

Just as the lone sun (*oṉṟām iravi*) is reflected [as many suns] in several vessels (*palapāṇṭattu uṇṭām*) containing water (*utakattu aṅkaṅkē niṉṟāṟ pōla*), the single object (*poruḷ*) [god] appears [as many] in several bodies (*uṭaltōṟum nikaḻntu niṟkum*). Just as the sun is independent of the vessels (*mēṟkaṇ ceṉṟāṟ pōla*), the senses and the sense organs (*pulaṉkaḷukkum cintai*) will not know [god] (*taṉakkum terivaritām*); that is why (*eṉṟāl*), [god] is beyond the reach (*eṭṭātāl*) of the six ways of knowing (*irumūṉṟu aḷavaikku*) such as perception etc. (*kāṭci*

[485] The six ways of knowing are the *pramāṇa*s (*aḷavai* in Tamil).The word signifies the essential means of arriving at valid knowledge. Advaita recognizes six ways of knowing: perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), comparison (*upamāna*), verbal testimony (*śabda*), postulation (*arthāpatti*), and non-apprehension (*anupalabdhi*). The Tamil equivalent words are *piratyaṭcam or kāṭci*, *aṉumāṉam*, *captam*, *uvamāṉam*, *aruttāpatti*, and *aṉupalapti.*

mutalāya).

VERSE 223

iruḷil paḻutai araveṉavē icaintu niṟkum iruṅkatirkaḷ
aruḷap paḻutai meyyāki aravum poyyām atuvēpōl
maruḷil cakamum cattāki maruvit tōṉṟum mācillāt
teruḷil cittē cattākum pittām cakattiṉ ceyal ellām.

[This verse asserts the illusory nature of the phenomenal world. "Just as the false belief, when a rope seen in darkness is mistaken for a snake, the world appears real due to ignorance. Just as in sunlight, the rope is perceived in its real nature, acquiring knowledge will dispel false perceptions of the world. Only Brahman is the ultimate truth"].

TRANSLATION:

At night (*iruḷil*), when a person mistakes a rope for a snake (*paḻutai araveṉavē*), he is afraid (*icaintu niṟkum*). [However], when sunlight appears (*iruṅkatirkaḷ aruḷa*), the rope becomes true (*paḻutai meyyāki*) and the snake becomes false (*aravum poyyām*). Similarly, (*atuvēpōl*), due to ignorance (*maruḷil*) caused by delusion (*maruvi*), the world appears as real (*cakamum cattāki tōṉṟum*). When perceived (*teruḷil*) with faultless (*mācillā*) knowledge (*cittē cattākum*), [it will become clear that] all the actions [appearances] in the world are due to lunacy [ignorance] (*pittām cakattiṉ ceyal ellām*).

VERSE 224

ulakam tāṉum niruvacaṉattu uṇṭām eṉṟēl utiyātu
nilavi uṇṭēl aḻiyātu niṟpa tākum mittaiyāl
ilaku cutti kaṉalcēra iṉṟām veḷḷi niṉṟatām
kulavu cakamum avikāram paramārt tattil koḷḷatāl.

[This verse reiterates the illusory nature of the phenomenal world. Only the

unchanging Brahman that contains the universe is real].

TRANSLATION:

The universe appears [from Brahman], whom, words cannot describe (*ulakam tāṉum niruvacaṉattu uṇṭām*). [Without Brahman, the universe] cannot come about (*eṉṟēl utiyātu*). If it originated on its own (*nilavi uṇṭēl*), it should never perish (*aḻiyātu niṟpatākum*), [but that is not the case]. [Everything is] illusory (*mittai*); when an oyster-shell and [a piece of] silver (*ilaku veḷḷi*) are heated to refine [them] (*cutti kaṉalcēra*), only the silver will survive (*niṉṟatām*). The immutable eternal truth [unchanging Brahman] (*avikāram paramārtam*) that contains the universe (*cakamum koḷḷatāl*) will [always] shine (*kulavu*).

VERSE 225

tāṅkum ulakukku upātāṉam cattām cilampi nūltaṉpāl
vāṅki vaittuk kāppatupōl vaiyam ellām taṉpakkal
ōṅka utippittu uḷatākki niṟutti oṭukkattu ilatākkum
āṅku vanta vāṟu ataṉāl cattām cakattiṉ amaivu ellām.

[The protagonist explains the nature of the universe. “Just as a spider produces silk to make its web, protects it, and finally takes it back into itself, Brahman is the creator, protector, and the destroyer of the universe”].

TRANSLATION:

[Brahman] offers the true essence (*cattām*) for the material cause (*upātāṉam*) of the universe (*tāṅkum ulakukku*). [Just as] the spider (*cilampi*) produces silk (*nūl*) [to make its web], protects it (*vaittuk kāppatupōl*), and [eventually] takes it back into itself (*taṉpāl vāṅki*), Brahman creates the entire phenomenal world (*vaiyam ellām taṉpakkal ōṅka utippittu*), sustains it (*niṟutti*), and [eventually], at the end, (*oṭukkattu*) dissolves it (*ilatākkum*). All activities (*āṅku vanta vāṟu ellām*) in this world (*cakattiṉ*) are fittingly (*ataṉāl amaivu*) due to his power (*cattām*).

VERSE 226

maṉṉum piramam taṉilvāṉāy vāṉiṉ vaḷiyāy antavaḷi
taṉṉil aḷalāy aḷaliṉpāl calamāyc calattil tāraṇiyāyc
coṉṉa itaṉiṉ maruntākit tōṟṟum maruntil aṉṉamāy
aṉṉam ataṉil tuvakku āti āṟu tātu āyiṉavāl.

[This verse provides details of the creation process].

TRANSLATION:

The sky appeared from the eternal Brahman (*maṉṉum piramam taṉilvāṉāy*), sky produced air (*vāṉiṉ vaḷiyāy*), air produced fire (*antavaḷi taṉṉil aḷalāy*), fire produced water (*aḷaliṉpāl calamāy*), [and] water produced earth (*calattil tāraṇiyāyc*). From these, vegetation appeared (*coṉṉa itaṉiṉ maruntākit tōṟṟum*), vegetation produced food (*maruntil aṉṉamāy*), and from food appeared (*aṉṉam ataṉil*) the chain of six substances [of the body][486] (*tuvakku āti āṟu tātu āyiṉavāl*).

VERSE 227

āṟu tātuk kaḷumkūṭi vanta kōcam aṉṉamayam
māṟil pirāṇa kōcamayam maṉṉum ataṉiṉ maṉōmayamtāṉ
vēṟu varumviñ ñāṉamayam mēvum ataṉiṉ atutaṉṉil
kūṟi varum āṉantamayam kōca mayampiṉ kūṭiyatāl.

[This verse explains the five sheaths covering the soul[487]].

TRANSLATION:

The merging of the six substances (*āṟu tātuk kaḷumkūṭi vanta*) produces the

[486] The six bodily substances are: skin, bones, nerves, bone marrow, blood, and semen. PILḶAI 1975:102.

[487] The self is concealed within five sheaths: food (*annamaya kośa*), vital forces (*prāṇamaya kośa*), mind (*manomaya kośa*), understanding or knowledge (*vijñānamaya kośa*), and bliss (*ānandamaya kośa*). (All terms in Sanskrit) See Zimmer 1974:415.. The equivalent Tamil terms are: *aṉṉamaya kōcam, pirāṇamaya kōcam, maṉōmaya kōcam, viññāṉamaya kōcam*, and *āṉantamaya kōcam.*

sheath of food (*aṉṉamayam kōcam*), which [in turn] produces (*māṟil*) the sheath of vital forces (*pirāṇamaya kōcam*), which [in turn] produces (*maṉṉum ataṉiṉ*) the sheath of mind (*maṉōmayamtāṉ*), which in turn provides (*vēṟu varum*) the sheath of knowledge (*viñāṉamayam*), which, when combined with other faculties (*mēvum ataṉiṉ ayampiṉ kūṭiyatāl*), produces the sheath of bliss (*āṉantamayam kōcam*).

Verse 228

kōca uruvil piramamtāṉ kūṭittōṉṟum nīṭumoru
kācam maruvum kaṭantōṟum niṉṟāl pōlak katiravaṉ taṉ
vīcu kiraṇam uruviṉ kaṇ veḷippaṭ ṭiṭuvatu atiṟparṟrum
pācam ataṉukku iṉṟākum eṉṟāl parattil parṟruṇṭō.

[Just as the sun is not contained by the many reflections seen in several pots of water, Brahman appears in several forms, but is not attached to them, nor do the forms shackle him].

TRANSLATION:

Brahman (*piramam*) appears united (*kūṭit tōṉṟum*) with the body composed of the [five] sheaths (*kōca uruvil tāṉ*). Just as the rays of sunlight (*katiravaṉ taṉ vīcu kiraṇam*) from the distant sky (*nīṭum oru kācam*) are reflected in several pots [of water] (*maruvum kaṭantōṟum niṉṟāl pōla*), it manifests itself (*veḷippaṭṭiṭuvatu*) in several forms (*uruviṉ kaṇ*), but it has no desire to be attached to bodies (*pācam iṉṟākum atiṟparṟrum ataṉukku*) and bodies cannot shackle it (*eṉṟāl parattil parṟruṇṭō*).

VERSE 229

alakiṉ maṇikaḷ avaikōvai aṭainta poḻutiṉ aṅkaṅkē
nilavum orunūl palaniṟamāy niṉṟāl pōla nīṭu uruvam
palavum maruvum pētattāl paṉmai yākum piramamtāṉ
kulavu pōka pōkkiyaṅkaḷ koḷḷum pōṉṟu koḷḷātal.

[Brahman appears as many but stays aloof despite the enjoyments of the individual souls].

TRANSLATION:

Just as when shell beads are strung together (*alakiṉ maṇikaḷ avaikōvai aṭainta poḻutiṉ*), the thread [used] that is visible here and there (*aṅkaṅkē nilavum orunūl*) appears to be many-colored (*palaniṟamāy niṉṟāl pōla*), [so too] Brahman, dwelling (*piramam tāṉ*) in different bodies (*nīṭu uruvam palavum*), appears as (*maruvum yākum*) many diverse beings (*pētattāl paṉmai*) [and yet] stays aloof (*pōṉṟu koḷḷātal*.) from the bodily enjoyments [of the souls] (*kulavu pōka pōkkiyaṅkaḷ koḷḷum*).

VERSE 230

pōṟṟum ceyālāl palanāmam puṉaintu pōka pōkkiyattil
tōṟṟum naṉavu kaṉaviṉuṭaṉ cuḻutti turiyam eytum itaṟku
ēṟṟa karaṇam nirainiraiyē īrēḻ nāl oṉṟu ellāmum
māṟṟi niṟkum kēṭiṉṟi vanta pōkam māyntiṭavē.

[The Māyāvādin (Advaitin) explains that Brahman appears to undergo the same experiences of the various states of the soul but in reality is immutable].

TRANSLATION:

Because of the several functions it [Brahman] carries out (*pōṟṟum ceyālāl*), it has several names (*palanāmam puṉaintu*) and appears as though (*tōṟṟum*) it is enjoying sensual pleasures (*pōka pōkkiyattil*) and experiences (*eytum*) such as the waking state (*naṉavu*), the dream state (*kaṉaviṉuṭaṉ*), the deep sleep state (*cuḻutti*) and the fourth state of consciousness (*turiyam*).[488] This is due to the role

[488] "*Turīya* [Sanskrit] – It is the fourth stage of experience where an individual soul goes beyond the waking, sleeping, and deep dreamless sleep. At this stage Brahman is realized." See CHAKRABORTY 2003:222. The equivalent Tamil terms for the four stages are: *naṉavu*, *kaṉavu*,

of the corresponding (*nirainiraiyē*) sense organs (*karaṇam*); fourteen (*īrēl̲*) during the waking state, four during the dream state (*nāl*), and one during the deep sleep state (*on̲r̲u*). In the faultless (*kēṭiṉ̲r̲i vanta*) [last stage] all these changes (*ellāmum mār̲r̲i nir̲kum*) and the enjoyments will vanish (*pōkam māyntiṭavē*).[489]

VERSE 231

karuvi ellām nāṉ̲ eṉ̲avē karutal pantam akkaruttai
oruva mutti uṇṭākum ul̲l̲am vittām ceytiyiṉ̲āl
maruvum māyā kāriyaṅkaḷ avittai māya vēmāyai
piriyum piriya ñāṉ̲am atu pir̲akkum pir̲avā pētamē.

["The soul experiences bondage due to false identification with the instruments of knowledge. Once they are dispelled by acquiring right knowledge, *māyā* will be destroyed, and at this stage, the non-differentiating knowledge of Brahman will result].

TRANSLATION:

Identifying oneself with bodily instruments of knowledge (*karuvi ellām nāṉ̲ eṉ̲avē*) results in bondage (*karutal pantam*); when this [false] knowledge is destroyed (*akkaruttai oruva*), salvation will result (*mutti uṇṭākum*); mind is the source [for this false knowledge] (*ul̲l̲am vittām*), and it enables (*ceytiyiṉ̲āl*) *māyā* to perform its acts (*maruvum māyā kāriyaṅkaḷ*); when ignorance perishes (*avittai māyavē*), *māyā* will disappear (*māyai piriyum*). Wisdom dawns (*ñāṉ̲am atu pir̲akkum*) when [*māyā* is] removed (*piriya*), and then the non-differentiating knowledge [of Brahman arises] (*pir̲avā pētamē*).

---

ur̲akkam, and *pēruṟakkam*.

[489] The fourteen mentioned during the waking state are the five motor organs, five sense organs, and the four internal organs. The four during the dream state are the four internal organs. The one during the deep sleep state is the mind. In the last stage all the instruments are transcended. See PIḶḶAI 1975:104.

VERSE 232

āṉa kaṉma aṉuṭṭayaṅkaḷ antakkaraṇa cuttitarum
ūṉam iṉṟi accutti ñāṉam ataṉai uṇṭākkum
ñāṉam atutāṉ piramattai nāṉeṉṟu uṇarttum nāṉpiṟantāl
vāṉa matinīrt tuḷakkam eṉak kāṇum taṉṉai māyaiyilē.

["Strict practice of the prescribed austerities will cleanse the instruments of knowledge. That will give rise to wisdom, which in turn will make one realize the true nature of oneself. This knowledge of self will allow one to clearly see the effects of *māyā*, as clear as the image of the moon is seen in still water"].

TRANSLATION:

Observing the prescribed rites (*āṉa kaṉma aṉuṭṭayaṅkaḷ*) will purify the inner instruments (*antakkaraṇa cuttitarum*) [of mind and intellect]. That purification carried out without a fault (*ūṉam iṉṟi accutti*) will give rise to wisdom (*ñāṉam ataṉai uṇṭākkum*). That wisdom (*ñāṉam atutāṉ*) will make one realize (*uṇarttum*) "I am Brahman" (*piramattai nāṉ eṉṟu*). With the knowledge of self (*nāṉpiṟantāl*), one can see the self in *māyā* (*taṉṉai māyaiyilē*), just as the moon's [reflection] (*vāṉa mati*) can be seen (*eṉak kāṇum*) in motionless water (*nīrt tuḷakkam*).

VERSE 233

tāṉē tāṉāy aṉupōkam taṉṉil taṉṉai aṉupavittiṭṭu
ūṉē uyirē uṇarvēyeṉṟu oṉṟum iṉṟi urai iṟantu
vāṉē mutalām pūtaṅkaḷ māya māyā tēmaṉṉi
nāṉē piramam eṉatteḷiyum ñāṉam pirama ñāṉamē.

[This verse explains the process of acquiring the knowledge of Brahman enabling one to proclaim, "I am Brahman"].

TRANSLATION:

When the self becomes self (*tāṉē tāṉāy*) and experiences (*aṉupōkam taṉṉil*) the enjoyment of the self in the self (*taṉṉai aṉupavittiṭṭu*), when the body (*ūṉ*), life

breath (*uyir*) and consciousness (*uṇarvu*) lose their identity (*oṉṟum iṉṟi*) and perish by attrition (*urai iṟantu*), when space and other elements disappear (*vāṉē mutalām pūtaṅkaḷ māya*), when [the knowledge is in] an unblemished state (*māyātē maṉṉi*), the realization (*eṉatteḷiyum*) and the knowledge (*ñāṉam*) that "I am Brahman" (*nāṉē piramam*) is the knowledge of Brahman (*pirama ñāṉamē*).

VERSE 234

cāṟṟum maṟaitat tuvamacimā vākki yaṅkaḷ tamaiuṇarntāl
pōṟṟi atunī āṉāy eṉṟu aṟaivatu allāl poruḷ iṉṟē
tēṟṟum itaṉait teḷiyātār teḷiyap pañca ātaṉamēl
ēṟṟa iyama niyamāti yōkam irunāṉku iyaṟṟuvarāl.

["The 'great sayings' of the Vedas have to be understood for one to gain knowledge. Those who do not understand their significance spend their time in yogic practices"].

TRANSLATION:

We should understand (*uṇarntāl*) the great sayings (*māvākkiyaṅkaḷ*)[490] such as "That thou art" (*tattuvamaci*), which the Vedas teach us (*cāṟṟum maṟai tamai*); they do not teach us any other truth (*allāl poruḷ iṉṟē*) other than that you are Brahman (*pōṟṟi atu nī āṉāy eṉṟu aṟaivatu*). Those who do not realize this truth (*tēṟṟum itaṉait teḷiyātār*), in trying to understand it (*teḷiya*), occupy themselves (*iyaṟṟuvarāl*) with five [yogic] postures (*pañca ātaṉamēl*) and the eight-limbed yoga (*irunāṉku yōkam*) involving abstinence, observance, and such things (*yama niyamāti*).[491]

---

[490] The four Vedic statements in Sanskrit "*Prajñānaṁ Brahma*" (Consciousness is Brahman), "*Ahaṁ Brahmāsmi*" (I am Brahman), "*Tat tvam asi*" (That thou art), and "*Ayamātma Brahma*" (This self is Brahman) are considered as "Great sayings" (*mahāvākya*s). CHAKRABORTY 2003:125.

[491] The eight-limbed yoga (*aṣṭāṅga yoga*) of Patañjali has the following limbs: *yama* (abstinence), *niyama* (observance), *āsana* (posture), *prāṇāyāma* (breath control), *pratyāhāra*

4.11B MĀYĀVĀDA (ADVAITIN) SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 235-252)

VERSE 235

ēkam nāṉeṉa iyampi ippaṭi aṟintu muttiyaṭai miṉ eṉa
mōkamāṉa urai cōkam iṉpoṭu muṭinti ṭātumalaṭu ākiya
kākamāṉatu karuṅkaliṉ tacai paṟitta ḷumkariya kuñciyiṉ
tāka mārpaci tavirkka vāyiṭai koṭuttatu eṉṟuraicey taṉmaiyē.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his criticism of the Māyāvādin. "Your call to others to follow your prescription to attain salvation by proclaiming 'I am Brahman' is not valid, because your statement introduces duality. Your delusional words are similar to saying that a barren crow picks some meat from a stone to feed its young!"].

TRANSLATION:

Calling yourself to be that unique entity [i.e. Brahman] (*ēkam nāṉeṉa iyampi*), [and] persuading others to reach salvation with the help of your words (*ippaṭi aṟintu muttiyaṭai miṉ eṉa*), [your words of] distress (*cōkam*) spoken in delusion (*mōkamāṉa urai*) will not result in happiness (*iṉpoṭu muṭinti ṭātu*). it is similar to saying that (*eṉṟuraicey taṉmaiyē*) an infertile crow (*malaṭu ākiya kākam āṉatu*) picks some meat from a black rock (*karuṅkaliṉ tacai paṟitta*) and puts it in the mouth (*vāyiṭai koṭuttatu*) of the crying black baby [crow] (*aḷum kariya kuñciyiṉ*) to assuage its extreme hunger (*mārpaci tavirkka*).

VERSE 236

nīṭu vētam aḷa vāka ēkameṉum nīti tāṉnikaḷvatu ākumēl
nāṭi ñātiruvum ñāṉam ñēyamuṭaṉ nāḷum nāṉmaṟaiyum ōtalāl

(withdrawl of the senses), *dhāraṇa* (concentration), *dhyāna* (meditation), and *samādhi* (absorption) [all terms in Sanskrit]. See RADHAKRISHNAN 1989:352.

ōṭum ākum uṉatu ēkam ōtum ivai ūṉamāki urai māṟukōḷ
kūṭu mākumaṉu pūti tāṉum atukūṭi ṭātuaṟivu lāmaiyāl.

["You claim Brahman to be the sole reality in the universe, and you base your opinion on the Vedas. However, you acknowledge the existence of a 'knower,' 'knowledge,' and the 'objects of knowledge.' Obviously, your logic is faulty"].

TRANSLATION:

You hold that according to the eternal Vedas (*nīṭu vētam aḷavāka*), there is only one [i.e. Brahman] (*ēkam eṉum*) that guides the universe (*nīti tāṉnikaḷvatu ākumēl*); the four Vedas state (*nāṉ maṟaiyum ōtalāl*) that they are the knower (*ñātiru*), the object of knowledge (*ñēyam*), and the knowledge (*ñāṉam*); everyday they are being sought (*nāṭi nāḷum*). Your [position of that] single entity (*uṉatu ēkam*) is defeated (*ōṭum ākum*), and your words become defective (*ōtum ivai ūṉamāki*) and take on contradictory meanings (*urai māṟukōḷ kūṭu mākum*). Even *aṉupūti*[492] cannot arise (*aṉupūti tāṉum atu kūṭiṭātu*) without consciousness (*aṟivu lāmaiyāl*).

VERSE 237

nīti yāl oḷikoḷ pāṉu vāṉatuakal nīri lēnikaḷu māṟupōl
āti tāṉ uruvam āya kāyam atil mēvi āvatilai yākumām
tītilā aruvam āta lālniḻalkaḷ cēra vēṟiṭam ilāmaiyāl
ōtil ōr akaliṉ nīrilē oruvar kāṇa lālilatuuṉ ēkamē.

["You stated that just as the reflections of the sun could be seen in pots holding water, Brahman appears as many objects in the world. This contradicts your position that Brahman is formless. Furthermore, if the pots of water are kept in shade, the reflections of the sun will not be there. If so, are there any bodies that

[492] The Tamil word "*aṉupūti*" refers to the process of perception, apprehension, and realization. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "aṉupūti" (p. 195)*.

are devoid of Brahman? Besides, just as there is a person to witness the reflection of the sun, there must be a soul to witness Brahman in the body. Therefore your logic is faulty"].

TRANSLATION:

[If you hold that Brahman appears as many] just as the sun's rays falling (*nīti yāl oḷikoḷ pāṉu vāṉatu*) on clay receptacles containing water (*akal nīrilē*) appear as many suns (*nikaḻu māṟupōl*), the eternal [Brahman], with faultless formless nature (*tītilā aruvam ātalāl*), cannot assume bodies with forms (*kāyam atil mēvi āvatilai yākumām*) by discarding his formless nature (*āti tāṉ uruvam āya*). [Furthermore], when the receptacle is kept in shade, where the sunlight does not fall (*niḻalkaḷ cēra vēṟiṭam ilāmaiyāl*), and the sun cannot be seen in the water (*ōr akaliṉ nīrilē oruvar kāṇalāl*). [This is similar to] the absence of your unique [Brahman] (*ilatu uṉ ēkamē*).

VERSE 238

vēṟu vāyilpula ṉōṭu mēlmaṉamum mēvi ṭātupira māṇamum
kūṟiṭātu aṟivu tāṉ eṉāuṇartal kōṭu nīmuyaliṉ nāṭiṉāy
īṟi lātaparam ēka mēeṉa iyampu nīicaiyum ñāṉamum
pēṟatu āvatilai pēta māṉaitu pēṇa vēuḷatu pēcilē.

[This verse asserts that souls and Brahman are different. "If Brahman dwells in the body, then it can function only with the help of the senses. The Vedas concur. If you disagree, then you are asserting the existence of a hare's horn. If the eternal Brahman appears as the individual soul, then the knowledge gained by that soul will not benefit you. It is important to know they are different"].

TRANSLATION:

The soul could not be knowledgeable (*aṟivutāṉ*) without working [in unison] (*mēviṭātu*) with the sense organs, internal senses, and the mind (*vāyil pulaṉōṭu mēl maṉamum*); so do the Vedas say (*piramāṇamum kūṟiṭa atu*). By not

understanding this (*uṇartal eṉā*), you are seeking a hare's horn (*nī muyaliṉ kōṭu nāṭiṉāy*). If you hold that (*iyampu nī*) the eternal Brahman (*īṟi lāta param*) appears as the individual soul (*ēkamē eṉa*), then that knowledge (*icaiyum ñāṉamum*) will not be of any use to you (*pēṟatu āvatilai*). The difference between the two (*pētamāṉa itu*) must be respected and articulated (*pēṇavē uḷatu pēcilē*).

VERSE 239

ilaku cōtimaṇi eṉavum ēkam eṉiṉ itaṉil ēkamatu vilakiṉāy
kulavu kācumoḷi atuvum nīṭivaḷar kuṇamum nāṭuvator kuṇiyumām
palavumāṉa kuṇam oruvum ēkamatu eṉavum nīpakariṉ nikarilā
ulaka māṉataṉai utavu māṟatilai uṇarvu tāṉumilai uṇarilē.

["Your statement that Brahman and the world have an inseparable union like that of a ruby and its brilliance is absurd. A ruby and its brilliance have the relationship between an object and its attribute. Therefore, your position that Brahman is without attributes is not tenable"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say that oneness (*eṉavum ēkam eṉiṉ*) is similar to a shining ruby and its brilliance (*ilaku cōtimaṇi*), you only destroy that oneness (*itaṉil ēkamatu vilakiṉāy*). Besides, the ruby and its brilliance (*kulavu kācumoḷi atuvum*) are related (*nīṭivaḷar*) just as an object (*kuṇi*) and its attributes (*kuṇamum nāṭuvator*). If you say that (*eṉavum nīpakariṉ*) [in spite of] many attributes (*palavumāṉa kuṇam*), there is one reality (*oruvum ēkam atu*) in this unequalled world (*nikarilā ulaka māṉataṉai*), then there will be nothing to create (*uṇarvu utavu māṟatilai*) and there will be no consciousness (*tāṉum ilai uṇarilē*).

VERSE 240

puṟṟiṉ nērpaḻutai tokka pōtumayir puḷakamāka ara iravilē
uṟṟatām ataṉai okkavē ulaku utikku māṟum oru cattilē
peṟṟa tākum eṉiṉ appi rāntiyuṭai yōrum appirama pētamāy

niṟpar nīpakariṉ muṟṟum aiyanilai peṟṟum iṉpatuatu ilātatām.

["You stated that your simile of one who was afraid when he mistook a rope for a snake in the dark is similar to mistaking the phenomenal world as real. If so, such a frightened and deluded person must also be part of your Brahman (that is, delusion is part of your Brahman). Such a position will only produce deluded knowledge, and you will never attain salvation"].

TRANSLATION:

[You hold] that the world (*ulaku*) is produced [from Brahman] (*oru cattilē peṟṟa tākum eṉiṉ*) and appears as real (*utikku māṟum*). If you say it is comparable to (*uṟṟatām ataṉai okkavē*) one who, during the night (*iravilē*), steps on (*tokka*) a straw (*nērpaḻutai*) in an anthill (*puṟṟiṉ*) [and mistakes it for a snake] and will experience an erection of hairs on his skin [horripilation] (*pōtu mayir puḷakam āka*), if so, even the person undergoing such a delusion (*appirāntiyuṭaiyōrum*) is part of your Brahman (*appirama pētamāy niṟpar*). Your words (*nī pakariṉ*) will only lead to deluded knowledge (*muṟṟum aiyanilai peṟṟum*) and will negate any experience of bliss (*iṉpatu atu ilātatām*).

VERSE 241

ōtiyē ulakam ataṉai nīyum niru vacaṉa mākaurai ceyvatueṉ
pētai yōy uḷatum ilatum alla poruḷ pēcu vārum uḷa rōcolāy
āti yēuḷatu varuta lāl ilatil āvatu iṉmaiatu aḻintupōm
nīti yāluḷatu ilāmai nērvatu eṉiṉ nērmai ākiyatu niṉṟatē.

["In spite of your Vedic practices why are you calling the indescribable (that is, both existing and non-existing)? How could an object be both existing and non-existing at the same time? If an object has an origin, it must have an existence. How could an object come into being, if it never existed?"].

TRANSLATION:

As an observer of Vedic prescriptions (*ōtiyē*), why are you calling (*nīyum urai ceyvatueṉ*) the world (*ulakam ataṉai*) indescribable (*niruvacaṉam*)?[493] You are ignorant (*pētai yōy*)! Tell me, is there someone (*uḷarō colāy*) who will say that (*pēcu vārum*) an object (*poruḷ*) exists (*uḷatum*) and [at the same time say] that it does not exist (*ilatum alla*)? If you negate that which exists from eternity (*ātiyē uḷatu varutalāl iṉmai*), then what does not exist, will perish (*ilatil āvatu atu aḻintupōm*). If what does not exist appears (*uḷatu ilāmai nērvatu eṉiṉ*), [then, it must have a first cause to] sustain it in good stead (*nīṯiyāl nērmai ākiyatu niṉṟatē*).

VERSE 242

vēṟatu ākiatupōl iruntamaiyil veḷḷi cutti eṉil aiyamē
kūṟalām oru parattoṭu ottaporuḷ koṇṭu viṇṭanilai kaṇṭaṉam
māṟi ṭātunilam nīra tākiaṉal vāyu vāki avai māṟiyum
cēṟi lātuviva kāram aṉṟupara mārtta māy atu ceṟintatē.

["If you state that Brahman and the phenomenal world are different from each other, but Brahman appears as the world, is questionable, it is as ridiculous as saying that earth could appear as water, fire as wind, water as earth, and wind as fire. We hold that the world is real"].

TRANSLATION:

If you hold that the unreal world appears (*vēṟatu ākiatupōl*) as [Brahman] just as

---

[493] *Anirvacanīya* is the Sanskrit equivalent for the Tamil term *niruvacaṉam.*

"While the other theories of error [in Indian epistemology] hold that the object of error is either *sat* or *asat*, Advaita maintains that the object of error is *anirvacanīya.*" See BALASUBRAMANIAN 1976:89.

"*Ajñāna* or nescience is said to be *anirvacanīya* or indescribable, because it cannot be described in any way. The reason is that it cannot fit into any of the known patterns in this creation that have been successfully described, such as *sat* or exiting and *asat* or non-existing." See HARSHANANDA 1990:35.

a piece of shell shines as silver (*iruntamaiyil veḷḷi cutti eṉil*), we can raise some doubts (*aiyamē kūṟalām*). We will dispute it (*kaṇṭaṉam*) if you hold that the world was one with Brahman earlier (*oru parattoṭu ottaporuḷ koṇṭu*), and it became separate (*viṇṭa nilai*) [later]. Earth will not become water (*nilam nīratāki māṟiṭātu*) and fire [will not become] air (*aṉal vāyuvāki*); even in a reverse order (*avai māṟiyum*), they will not merge (*cēṟilātu*). It is established that (*ceṟintatē*) [the world] is not just empirical (*vivakāram*), but it is also something real (*paramārttam*).

VERSE 243

māya nūlatu cilampi vāyiṉ iṭai vanta vāṟu ataṉai māṉavē
āya tēulaka māṉa tumpiramam ataṉi lēeṉil aṭaṅkiniṉṟu
ēyum ākumoru cittum attuṭaṉ nilātu eṉṟupiṉ iyampiṉnī
pēya ṉēkaṭam miruttil vantatu piṟappatu āvatilai pēcilē.

["If the created world is similar to the silk from a spider, how could the formless and changeless Brahman is formed into the phenomenal world? If you say Brahman just acts as a witness, you are foolish to suggest that an earthen pot appears by itself"].

TRANSLATION:

If you hold that just as the false silk (*māya nūlatu*) coming out of a spider (*cilampi vāyiṉ iṭai vanta vāṟu*) eventually disappears back into the spider (*ataṉai māṉavē āyatē*), [and] the false world appears out of Brahman (*ulakam āṉatum piramam ataṉilē eṉil*), then even intelligence [Brahman] becomes contained [in this world] (*aṭaṅkiniṉṟu ēyum ākumoru cittum*). If you say that (*iyampiṉ nī*) [Brahman] stands aside [as an observer] without participating (*attuṭaṉ nilātu eṉṟupiṉ*), you are a fool! (*pēyaṉē*)! The pot is made from earth (*kaṭam miruttil vantatu*), and it does not appear by itself (*piṟappatu āvatilai*).

VERSE 244

vēṟa tākumuru vatti lēparam veḷippa ṭumeṉa viḷampilnī
ūṟilā uru acatti lēpiramam uṇṭu tāṉ uṇarvu ilātatu eṉ
māṟi vāyuvum aṉāti yāṉavaiyum vanti ṭāmaiyiṉil iṉṟeṉil
īṟu tāṉ uṭaiyatāya tōpiramam eṉko lōivai iṟappatē.

["It is ludicrous for you to suggest that Brahman dwells in all bodies without any attachment. Then why does Brahman stay attached to unconsciousness and even dead bodies? It strongly suggests that Brahman is intellectually challenged or his senses are dead"].

TRANSLATION:

You proclaim that (*nī viḷampil*) the supreme [Brahman] (*param*) appears in different bodies (*vēṟatākum uruvattilē veḷippaṭum eṉa*). If so, Brahman (*piramam*) must be present (*uṇṭu tāṉ*) in dead bodies (*ūṟilā uru*), in inanimate objects (*acattilē*), and in unconscious [bodies] (*uṇarvu ilātatu*). If you state (*iṉṟeṉil*) [that they are not active in such states because of] lack of (*vantiṭāmaiyiṉil*) vital air (*vāyuvum*) and other elements (*aṉāti āṉavaiyum*), it suggests that Brahman's (*piramam*) senses are diminished (*īṟu tāṉ ivai*) or become inactive (*uṭaiyatāya tō eṉkolō*) or even dead (*iṟappatē*).

VERSE 245

paṟṟatu iṉṟiuṭal niṉṟi ṭumparam eṉappa karntaṉai parintuṭaṉ
uṟṟu uṭampu narai tiraikaḷ nōyciṟai uṟuppu aḻintu ivaiyum uḷḷapiṉ
kuṟṟam eṉṟuitaṉai viṭṭi ṭātuviṭa eṉṟa lumkulaivu koṇṭiṭum
peṟṟi kaṇṭumoru paṟṟu aṟumparicu pēca vēuḷatu uṉ ācaiyē.

[The body in which Brahman dwells deteriorates with old age and disease, yet he does not abandon the body. It clearly shows that Brahman is attached to the body, and if you think otherwise it is your dreaming].

TRANSLATION:

You stated that (*eṉap pakarntaṉai*) even while the supreme [Brahman] (*param*) is present in a body (*uṭal niṉṟi*), he will remain unattached (*paṟṟatu iṉṟi*). The body (*uṭampu*), so tenderly assumed by [Brahman] (*parintuṭaṉ uṟṟu*), deteriorates (*uṟuppu aḻintu*) with gray hair (*narai*), wrinkled skin (*tiraikaḷ*), disease (*nōy*), and emaciation (*ciṟai*). In spite of all these (*ivaiyum uḷḷapiṉ*), he will not abandon the body as defective (*kuṟṟam eṉṟuitaṉai viṭṭi ṭātu*), and he will grieve (*kulaivu koṇṭiṭum*) at the thought of leaving (*viṭa eṉṟalum*). Witnessing such an attachment to the body (*peṟṟi kaṇṭumoru paṟṟu*), if you say there is no attachment to the body (*aṟumparicu pēca vē*), it is your dreaming (*uḷatu uṉ ācaiyē*).

VERSE 246

cōti māmaṇikaḷ ūṭu pōṉatoru nūlum āṉanilai colliṭum
nīṭiyāl maṇikaḷpēta mākiyoru nūlil niṉṟamai nikaḻttiṉāy
āti tāṉoruva ṉāki yēpala aṉanta yōṉiyil amarntavaṉ
pēti yātanilai pēci ṉāyulaku pēta mēilatu apētamē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out the differentiated world contrary to the Māyavādin's doctrine of undifferentiated world].

TRANSLATION:

You described (*nikaḻttiṉāy*) a thread used in stringing together (*ūṭu pōṉatoru nūlum*) shiny beads of shells (*cōti māmaṇikaḷ*) and the string assuming the color of the beads (*āṉanilai colliṭum*) [and how], though the beads are many, (*maṇikaḷpēta mākiy*), they stay in one string (*oru nūlil niṉṟamai*). You said that (*pēciṉāy*) though Brahman is one (*āti tāṉ oruvaṉākiyē*), he locates himself in many bodies (*pala aṉanta yōṉiyil amarntavaṉ*) and remains unchangeable (*pētiyāta nilai*). [If so,] the differentiated world (*ulaku pētamē*) negates [your doctrine of] non-differentiation (*apētamē ilatu*).

VERSE 247

ottu niṉṟuṭaliṉ iṉpa tuṉpamavai uṟṟum uṟṟiṭuvatu iṉreṉum

pitta uṉṉuraiyil uṟṟatē ilatu peṟṟatu iṉilatu peṟṟatēl
tuyttal eṉṟuṉuṟutal cīva pāvamatu colliṉ oṉṟiṉuntōyvu ilāmainī
vaittu nittamaṉa vākku iṟantaparam eṉṉa māṉamilai iṉṉamē.

["Your claim that you are Brahman is not substantiated by your treatise"].

TRANSLATION:

Staying with the body (*ottu niṉṟuṭaliṉ*), [the self] experiences (*uṟṟum*) pleasures and pains (*iṉpa tuṉpam avai*). Yet, you foolishly (*pitta*) say that it does not participate [experience] (*uṟṟiṭuvatu iṉṟeṉum*); it does not appear so in your treatise (*uṉṉuraiyil uṟṟatē*). This is not from your treatise nor is it from experience (*ilatu peṟṟatu iṉilatu*), but you say it is just caused (*peṟṟatēl*), and the enjoyment [experience] (*tuyttal*) is just an appearance in the soul (*cīva pāvamatu colliṉ*). You are shameless in stating (*māṉam ilai iṉṉamē*) that without any attachment (*oṉṟiṉuntōyvu ilāmai*), beyond thought and speech (*maṉa vākku iṟanta*), you are that Brahman (*nī nitta param*).

VERSE 248

eṅkum niṉṟiṭil avattai iṉṟiṭum icaintiṭum karaṇam eṉṉilnī
aṅku niṉṟaparam eṅku oḷittatuatu niṉṟa tēlavai aṭaṅkiṭā
iṅku niṉṟatoru kānta māṉakal irumpu canniti iyaṅkunēr
taṅki niṉṟatueṉil nīṅki mīḷumvakai taṅkiṭātu uṉurai tappatē.

[If a soul fills completely the body in which it dwells, then it will not experience the *avasthā* and become inactive. If you hold that the instruments of the mind experience the *avasthā*, and not the soul, then where did your god, living in the body, hide? You compared god's action on the instruments of the mind to a magnet's attraction on the iron filings, but your analogy does not explain how the instruments of the mind become inactive"].

TRANSLATION:

If [Brahman] pervades everywhere (*eṅkum niṉṟiṭil*), it cannot experience the three-fold aspect of Śiva or *avattai* (*avattai iṉṟiṭum*).[494] If you say that the instruments of the mind[495] undergo changes (*icaintiṭum karaṇam eṉṉil nī*), where did Brahman who was there (*aṅku niṉṟa param*), hide (*eṅku oḷittatu*)? if you say that activity is not due to the soul (*atu niṉṟa tēlavai aṭaṅkiṭā*), but, just as iron's (*irumpu*) movement is controlled (*iyaṅkunēr*) by a magnet (*kāntamāṉa*) in its proximity (*iṅku niṉṟatoru kal canniti*), [and] the mind's instruments are controlled (*taṅki niṉṟatueṉil*) [by the soul], then [just as the iron] cannot separate itself from the magnet (*nīṅki mīḷum vakai taṅkiṭātu*), [the instruments of the mind cannot leave the self]. Your words are wrong (*uṉ urai tappatē*).

VERSE 249

iruḷpō tintatuoru pariti ivvulakil icaiyil iṉṟuuṭalam nāṉ eṉum
maruḷpō tintatoru piramam iṅku uḷatu maruvi niṉṟauru oruviyē
teruḷpō tintuparaṉ nāṉ eṉumteḷivu ceṉṟa pōtukati eṉṟiṭum
poruḷpo tintatu eṉil amala ṉukkumalam varuta lāluḷatu puṉmaiyē.

["If impurity is ascribed to the soul, which is none other than Brahman according to you, then Brahman is also afflicted with impurity"].

TRANSLATION:

Brahman is veiled by ignorance (*maruḷ potintatoru piramam uḷatu*) and identifies itself with bodies (*icaiyil iṉṟu uṭalam nāṉ eṉum*) in the world (*ivvulakil*), just as the sun (*pariti*) is veiled by darkness (*iruḷ potintatu*). You say that [Brahman], after leaving the ignorant body (*maruvi niṉṟa uru oruviyē*) gets the [proper] knowledge

---

[494] *Avattai* (avasthā in Sanskrit) is a technical term used in Śaiva Siddhānta. It represents the three-fold aspect of Śiva, namely dissolution (*ilayam*) enjoyment (*pōkam*), and action (*atikāram*). *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "Avattai" (p. 152)*.

[495] *antakkaraṇam* – it is the inner seat of thought, feeling, and volition, consisting of four aspects, namely, mind (*maṉam*), intellect (*putti*), will (*cittam*), and ego (*akaṅkāram*). *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "antakkaraṇam" (p. 78)*. For brevity, I call them the instruments of the mind.

(*teruḷ pōtintu*) to clearly understand (*teḷivu ceṉṟa pōtu*) that "I am Brahman" (*paraṉ nāṉ eṉum*), becomes itself (*poruḷ potintatu eṉil*), and attains salvation (*kati eṉṟiṭum*). This is faulty (*puṉmaiyē*) [as it suggests that] one without any impurity (*amalaṉukku*) is afflicted with impurity (*malam varutalāl uḷatu*).

VERSE 250

cuttam āṉatu paratti ṉukku aṇaivatu iṉṟu cuttamatu anātinī
vaitta māyam uṟu cittu acuttamuṟa maṟṟu ataṟkumalam vaittaṉai
otta cīvaṉmalam kaṉmam māyaiuṟu kiṉṟa kāraṇam uṇarntiṭāy
pitta ṉēviṟaki nilpi ṟappatueri eṉṉil vēṟuporuḷ peṟṟatē.

["You do not comprehend the nature of the soul, impurities, karma, *māyā*, and their First Cause"].

TRANSLATION:

Purity (*cuttam āṉatu*) is inherent to, and eternal (*anāti*) in, Brahman (*parattiṉukku*) and not acquired (*aṇaivatu iṉṟu*). You say that the impurity (*nī vaitta uṟu acuttam*) of the soul (*cittu*) derived from Brahman is caused by delusion (*māyam*), which in turn makes Brahman impure (*ataṟkumalam vaittaṉai*). You are being foolish (*pittaṉ*) in not understanding (*uṇarntiṭāy*) the cause of (*kāraṇam*) why the soul experiences (*cīvaṉ uṟukiṉṟa*) impurity (*malam*), karma (*kaṉmam*) and *māyā* (*māyai*); if you say it is similar to the fire (*eri eṉṉil*) that is already latent in firewood (*viṟakinil piṟappatu*), it introduces duality (*vēṟu poruḷ peṟṟatē*).

VERSE 251

uṉṉil nīyumaṉu pōkam eṉṟapoḻutu uṟṟiṭum tuvitam maṟṟuatuiṅku
eṉṉil illai eṉil illai nīyumaṟi viṉmai kaṇṭaiṭam uṇmaiyēl
maṉṉum ōr uṇarvu vantiṭum uṇarvu elāmum māyaiyeṉil māyaiyē
coṉṉatu ōrpiramam āyiṭum piramam māyai yāyaṟivu cōrumē.

[Duality is involved when there is a perceiver and an object perceived. If

Brahman perceives itself, then there is duality. If it is suggested that such consciousness is produced by *māyā*, then Brahman also is a product of *māyā*].

TRANSLATION:

When you experience "you" in yourself (*uṉṉil nīyumaṉu pōkam eṉṟapoḻutu*), duality arises (*uṟṟiṭum tuvitam*). [Besides,] if you do not perceive yourself as the perceiver (*maṟṟu atu iṅku eṉṉil illai*), then there is no "you" (*eṉil illai nīyum*). If removal of ignorance (*aṟiviṉmai*) takes one to heaven (*kaṇṭa iṭam uṇmaiyēl*), then even there consciousness will be present (*maṉṉum* ōr *uṇarvu vantiṭum*). If you say that consciousness thus gained is caused by *māyā* (*uṇarvu elāmum māyai yeṉil*), then Brahman is also reduced to *māyā* (*māyaiyē coṉṉatu ōr piramam āyiṭum*). If Brahman becomes *māyā*, it will lose [all] knowledge (*piramam māyaiyāy aṟivu cōrumē*).

VERSE 252

āra ṇaṅkaḷtaru tattuvam acipa taṅka ḷiṉporuḷ aṟintiṭāy
kāraṇam atuvum nīyum eṉṟuirumai kaṇṭu vēṟatuiṉmai karutiṭāy
nāra ṇaṉpirama ṉālum nāṭariya nāya kaṉkaḻalkaḷ naṇṇinī
ēr aṇaintupoli cāta ṉaṅkaḷkoṭu yōka ñāṉamum iyaṟṟiṭē.

[This is the concluding verse of the Śaiva Siddhāntin's critique of the Māyāvādins. He elaborates on the *mahāvākya*, *tat tvam asi*. The real significance of the statement is that the self is non-different from Brahman, but they are not identical. The significance of this statement is beyond comprehension even for Viṣṇu and Brahmā. If you worship Śiva and follow the yogic and knowledge paths, you will attain salvation].

TRANSLATION:

You do not know the meaning (*pataṅkaḷiṉ poruḷ aṟintiṭāy*) of the great Vedic

saying "*tattvamasi*" (*āraṇaṅkaḷ tattuvam aci*).[496] Understand the duality (*irumai kaṇṭu*) between you and the First Cause (*kāraṇam atuvum nīyum eṉṟu*) and do not consider anything different (*vēṟatu iṉmai karutiṭāy*). Even Nārāyaṇaṉ (Viṣṇu) and Piramaṉ (Brahmā) (*nāraṇaṉ pirama ṉālum*) seek to understand [the Vedic saying] (*nāṭariya*). If you reach out and worship the anklets [feet] of Śiva (*nāyakaṉ kaḻalkaḷ naṇṇi nī*), and if you develop and practice the prescriptions (*ēr aṇaintu poli cāta ṉaṅkaḷ koṭu*) of the yoga and knowledge (paths) (*yōka ñāṉamum iyaṟṟiṭē*) [you will attain salvation].

4.12A BHĀSKARA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 253-254)

VERSE 253

maṉṉum maṟaiyiṉ muṭivueṉṟu māyā vāti uṭaṉmalaintu
piṉṉam ākip piramattaip pētā pētam cātittup
paṉṉum orunūl atuvākap pāriṉ mītu pāṟkariyaṉ
coṉṉa itaṉai innūliṉ akattē tōṉṟac colliṭuvām.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his description of the Bhāskara school[497], which agrees with the Māyāvāda school about the revealed nature of the Vedas].

TRANSLATION:

[The Bhāskara school] declares the end of the Vedas (*maṉṉum maṟaiyiṉ muṭivueṉṟu*), differs from and disputes (*malaintu piṉṉam āki*) the Māyāvādins (*māyā vāti uṭaṉ*), and argues that (*cātittu*) Brahman (*piraman*) is not one with identity but one with identity-in-difference (*pētā pētam*). This is because of [his ignorance of] the much studied Vedas (*paṉṉum orunūl atuvāka*). The school

---

[496] See the footnote in verse 235.

[497] Bhāskara (circa 7th century CE) was a near contemporary of Śaṅkara but disagreed with his brand of Advaita. He maintained, instead, a *bhedābheda* (identity in difference) stance holding that the world is one, but its diversity is real. See JOHNSON 2009:56.

expounded by Bhāskara (*pāṟkariyaṉ coṉṉa itaṇai*) in this world (*pāriṉ mītu*) will be clearly explained inside this treatise (*innūliṉakattē tōṉṟac colliṭuvām*).

VERSE 254

cittē ulakāyp pariṇamittuc cīva ṉākit tikaḻntamaiyāl
cattē ellām muttiyiṉaic cārak kaṇṭa ñāṉaṅkaḷ
vaittē moḻiyum māmaṟaikaḷ coṉṉa marapē vantakkāl
ottē keṭṭup piramattōṭu oṉṟāyp pōmeṉṟu uraittaṇaṇē.

[Bhāskara holds that souls are real because they are manifestations of Brahman].

TRANSLATION:

[Brahman appears] as intelligence in the world (*cittē ulakāy*), facilitates evolution (*pariṇamittu*) of souls (*cīvaṉ āki*) and excels (*tikaḻntamaiyāl*) in creating all intelligence (*cattē ellām*). The great Vedas (*māmaṟaikaḷ*) impart the knowledge required by the souls (*ñāṉaṅkaḷ vaittē moḻiyum*) desirous of attaining salvation (*muttiyiṉaic cārak kaṇṭa*). They teach that (*uraittaṇaṇē*) acquiring that knowledge (*coṉṉa marapē*) and following the injunctions prescribed (*vantakkāl ottē keṭṭu*) [will allow the seeker] to merge with Brahman (*piramattōṭu oṉṟāyppōm eṉṟu*).

4.12B BHĀSKARA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 255-259)

VERSE 255

iyampu kiṉṟatuulaku āyi ṭātucaṭam iṉṟi niṉṟucaṭa mākiyē
muyaṅku kiṉṟamaiyil ilavaṇattu iratam muḻutu mēkaṉatai
muyalkaipōl
payantatu eṉṉilaṟi yappa ṭumporuḻum aṟivum eṉṟupala ākumō
tiyaṅku kiṉṟatueṉ uraitti ṭāykaṭiṉam āti yākivaru cittaṉē.

[Aruṇanti begins his discourse as the *siddhāntin* of the Bhāskara school. “Brahman cannot become both matter and something other than matter. If you

compare it to the salt dissolved in sea-water and how salt appears as part of the sea-water, your analogy is not valid because the natures of salt and water are quite different"].

TRANSLATION:

From what you say about Brahman (*iyampukiṉṟatu*), he cannot become the world (*ulaku āyiṭātu*) [because then, the world would be] devoid of inanimate objects [matter] (*caṭam iṉṟi niṉṟu*) and [intelligence] cannot merge with matter (*caṭam ākiyē muyaṅkukiṉṟamaiyil*). If you say that just as salt dissolves in seawater (*ilavaṇattu iratam*), evolving objects are embedded in intelligence (*muḻutu mēkaṉatai muyalkaipōl payantatu eṉṉil*). Will the object known and the cognizer [of the object] (*aṟiyappaṭum poruḷum aṟivum*) become many [separate] (*eṉṟu pala ākumō*)? Do not confuse yourself with your words (*tiyaṅkukiṉṟatu eṉ uraittiṭāy*). The learned one (*cittaṉē*) knows the origin of elements such as hardness (*kaṭiṉam āti yāki varu*).

VERSE 256

uṉṉu kiṉṟapira matti lēciṟituiv ulakam āṉateṉa ōtiṉnī
maṉṉu kiṉṟacila kāl mōṭuaḻiyum aḻiya vantuutavu māyaiyāl
taṉṉil oṉṟumeṉil varutalōṭuiṟuti taruta lāl atuca ṭattatām
uṉṉoṭu accakamum uṇmai yaṉṟucaṭam eṉṉa vēuṟuti maṉṉumē.

["If you claim that only part of Brahman forms the world, then this part will be destroyed in time. Therefore, you imply that Brahman is destructible. Your claim that Brahman is immutable is not valid"].

TRANSLATION:

If you say (*ōtiṉ nī*) that Brahman (*piraman*), who is beyond human thought (*uṉṉukiṉṟa*) [differentiated slightly] and that small part became the world (*ciṟitu ivulakam āṉateṉa*), then the world will stay for a while (*maṉṉu kiṉṟa cila kālmōṭu*) and then be dissolved (*aḻiyum*). After dissolution (*aḻiya*), it will appear again

(*vantu*) with *māyā*'s help (*utavu māyaiyāl*). If you say that [the world] merges [itself into Brahman] (*taṉṉil oṉṟum eṉil*), then [this Brahman] becomes inert matter (*atu caṭatta tām*) because of its [repeated] appearance and dissolution (*varutalōṭu iṟuti tarutalāl*). That confirms (*uṟuti maṉṉumē*) that you and the world [Brahman] (*uṉṉoṭu accakamum*) are not intelligent (*uṇmai yaṉṟu*) but insentient (*caṭam eṉṉavē).*

VERSE 257

vittē ḻuntumara māyvi ḻaintamai viḻampi ṉāuvamai vēṟunī
nittam eṉṟaurai poyttu nīṭucaṭa māy eḻuntuaḻiyum niṉparam
ottu eḻumpoḻutu vitti ṉukkuavaṉi uṇṭu tārakam uṉakkueṉā
pittaṉ eṉrū ulaku uraitti ṭumpiramam āyi ṉāy ivaipi taṟṟiyē.

["You compared Brahman and the evolution of the world to a tree resulting from a seed. If so, the tree gets nourishment from the earth, and where does Brahman get nourishment? With your delusional words you appear as insane as Brahman"].

TRANSLATION:

Your simile (*viḻampiṉā uvamai*) [compares the evolution of the world] to a seed which becomes a tree (*vittēḻuntu maramāy viḻaintamai*). Your words that he is eternal (*nittam eṉṟa urai*) are false (*poy*) because he will be born and die (*eḻuntu aḻiyum*) as insentient (*nīṭu caṭamāy*) and non-eternal (*niṉparam*). [Furthermore,] when the seed (*vitti*) develops (*ottu eḻumpoḻutu*), the earth (*avaṉi*) supports it with nourishment (*uṇṭu tārakam*), [but,] none for you (*uṉakku eṉā*). If you say that (*uraittiṭum*) you have become Brahman (*piramam āyiṉāy*), the world (*ulaku*) will consider you mad (*pittaṉ eṉrū*) with delusional words (*ivai pitaṟṟiyē*).

VERSE 258

cūṭa kamkaṭakammōti ramcavaṭi toṭaroṭu ārammuṭi tōṭunāṉ
āṭa kamtaruva tākum ippaṭi aṉaittum appiramam ākumēl

nīṭum appaṇikaḷ ceytu ḷōravai puṉaintu lōrkaḷai nikaḻittuṭum
nāṭi ṭumcakam iyaṟṟu vōrkoṭu naṭattu vōruḷarna viṟṟilē.

["You say that just as there are several ornaments made from gold, all objects of the world have originated from Brahman, then just as there is a goldsmith to make the ornaments there must be a creator of this world. Know that just as there are people making ornaments and people wearing them, there must be someone to create this world and people for whom the world was created"].

TRANSLATION:

[Jewelry such as] a bracelet (*cūṭakam*), an armlet (*kaṭakam*), a ring (*mōtiram*), a necklace (*cavaṭi*), a chain (*toṭaroṭu*), a pendant (*āram*), a tiara (*muṭi*), an ear-jewel (*tōṭu*), and a waist-string (*nāṇ*) are all made of (*taruva tākum*) gold (*āṭakam*). If everything has appeared from Brahman (*ippaṭi aṉaittum appiramam ākumēl*), then this necessitates (*nikaḻittuṭum*) the existence of the makers of those ornaments (*nīṭum appaṇikaḷ ceytuḷōr*) and [as well as] those who wear them (*avai puṉaintulōrkaḷai*). [Similarly], if you investigate (*naviṟṟilē*), [you will find that] there is someone to create this world (*nāṭiṭum cakam iyaṟṟuvōr*) and there are people for whom this world was created (*koṭu naṭattuvōr uḷar*).

VERSE 259

aṟivi ṉōṭuceyal māṟil vīṭu ataṉai aṇuka oṇātuavai iraṇṭiṉāl
uṟuti yāṉapira matti ṉōṭuaḻiya oṉṟa lāmeṉa uraittikāṇ
iṟuti yēlataṉoṭu icaivatu iṉṟuicaivatu uḷḷa tāyiṭiṉav iṉpamē
peṟuti nīuṭaloṭu uyirka ḷāyaṟivu piriyu māṟuceyal peṟuvateṉ.

[This is the last verse in Aruṇanti's discourse as the *siddhāntin* of the Bhāskara school. "You claim that salvation cannot be attained by destroying intelligence and action; yet, you say one can reach Brahman by eliminating intelligence and action. If they are destroyed by what means one could reach Brahman? If one could enjoy bliss of the union with Brahman in this body, why should one

undergo self-mortification and suffer the pain?].

TRANSLATION:

By removing knowledge and action (*aṟiviṉōṭu ceyal māṟil*), salvation (*vīṭu*) cannot be achieved (*ataṉai aṇuka oṇātu*). You say that (*eṉa uraittikāṇ*) only by following both paths [knowledge and action] (*avai iraṇṭiṉāl*) and with [the help of] Brahman who supports them (*uṟutiyāṉa piramattiṉōṭu*), they can be eliminated (*aḻiya oṉṟalām*). If [knowledge and action are] destroyed (*iṟutiyēl*), then there are no means to unite with [Brahman] (*ataṉoṭu icaivatu iṉṟu*). If unity [with Brahman] (*icaivatu*) can be achieved (*uḷḷa tāyiṭiṉ*) [without destroying knowledge and action], then [instead of] enjoying that bliss in this body (*aviṉpamē peṟuti uṭaloṭu*), why should the knowledge of the souls be removed (*uyirkaḷāy aṟivu piriyumāṟu*) making them suffer the agony (*ceyal peṟuvateṉ*)?

4.13A NIRĪŚVARA SĀṀKHYA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSE 260)

VERSE 260

mūlam puriyaṭ ṭakamvikirti āki mūṉṟāyp pirakiruti
tūlam cūkkam paramāyas cutta puruṭaṉ caṉṉitiyil
pālaṉ cēṭṭai purintuulakam yōṉi palavāyp parantu oṭuṁkum
cāla eṉṟu nirīccuvara cāṁki yaṉtāṉ cārṟiṭumē.

[Aruṇanti begins his discourse as the *pūrvapakṣin* of the Nirīśvara school[498] and succinctly summarizes the important aspects of the school in one verse. *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* are the two ultimate realities, which are independent of each other. *Puruṣa* is the conscious principle while *Prakṛti* is the eternal unconscious principle and the ultimate cause of the world. *Prakṛti* divides itself into *mūlam* (root), *puriyaṭṭakam* (subtle body), and *vikirti* (gross body as well as the

[498] Kapila (fl. before 6th century BCE?) is said to have founded the Sāṁkhya system, and his philosophy is often referred to as Nirīśvara Sāṁkhya because of the atheistic (agnostic) position in his teachings. See ZIMMER 1974:281-282.

universe).

The equivalent Sanskrit terms for the three constituent parts of *Prakṛti* are *param*, *sūkṣmam*, and *sthūlam*. The eight constituents of the subtle body or *puriyaṭṭakam* are sound (*ōcai*), touch (*ūṟu*), sight (*vaṭivam*), taste (*cuvai*), smell (*nāṟṟam*), mind (*maṉam*), intellect (*putti*), and ego (*akaṅkāram*)].

TRANSLATION:

Prakṛti (*pirakiruti*) divides itself into three parts (*mūṉṟāy*) as root (*mūlam*), subtle body (*puriyaṭṭakam*), and gross body as well as the universe (*vikirti*); [the parts] manifests themselves as supreme (*param*), subtle (*cūkkam*), and gross (*tūlam*), [respectively]. Pure *puruṣa* (*cutta puruṭaṉ*) in the proximity (*caṉṉitiyil*) [of *prakṛti*] will act with childish innocence (*pālaṉ cēṭṭai purintu*) and think that he is one with the many forms of lives in the world (*ulakam yōṉi palavāyp parantu*). [When he realizes] the mistake, he will leave [*prakṛti*] (*oṭuṅkum cāla eṉṟu*). So says the adherent of the non-theistic Sāṁkhya school (*nirīccuvara cāṅkiyaṉ tāṉ cāṟṟiṭumē*).

4.13B NIRĪŚVARA SĀṂKHYA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 261-263)

VERSE 261

cuttaṉ aṟivaṉ puruṭaṉeṉil cūḻā tākum pirakiruti
pettam nīṅki ṉālumpiṉ pettaṉ āvaṉ pēraṟivāl
kattam mēvum pirakiruti kaṇṭu kaḻikka māṭṭāṉēl
muttaṉ ākāṉ cuttaṉukku mūlappiraki rutiilaiyām.

[Aruṇanti begins his discourse as the *siddhāntin* of the Nirīśvara school Sāṁkhya school. If you say *puruṣa*'s nature is pure intelligence, then *prakṛti* can never cover it. That means the bondage between the two is unintelligible. Furthermore, how could a liberated soul prevent being covered by *prakṛti* again?].

TRANSLATION:

If *puruṣa* has pure intelligence (*cuttaṉ aṟivaṉ puruṭaṉ eṉil*) then [the impure]

prakṛti cannot engulf it (*cūḻātākum pirakiruti*). If not, even after discarding all attachments (*pettam nīṅkiṉālum*), it [*puruṣa*] will become attached again (*piṉ pettaṉ āvaṉ*). [If *puruṣa*], with its great knowledge (*pēraṟivāl*), cannot discern the impurity in *prakṛti* (*kattam mēvum pirakiruti kaṇṭu*) and cannot eliminate it (*kaḻikka māṭṭāṉēl*), then it [*puruṣa*] cannot be called one without attachment (*muttaṉ ākāṉ*). Pure *puruṣa* cannot be veiled by primordial matter (*cuttaṉukku mūlappirakiruti ilaiyām*).[499]

VERSE 262

puruṭaṉ piraki rutiperṟāl pōtam ciṟituaṅku uṇṭākik
kuruṭaṉ mutukil mūṭavaṉiruntu ūrntāṟ pōlap pirakiruti
iruḻtaṉ ṉiṭattē iruntuiyaṅkum kaṉmāl iṟaiyaṉṟu iraṇṭiṉaiyum
maruḻtaṉ uruvāyc cēṭṭippittu aṟiyum amalaṉ araṉēyām.

[According to Aruṇanti, there is no *prakṛti to be witnessed by a liberated puruṣa,* and hence the question of witnessing *prakṛti is a moot point. Puruṣa* loses part of its intelligence by the union with *prakṛti. Together, they move slowly just as a lame person piggybacks on a blind person. However, this cannot take place without* Śiva's guidance].

TRANSLATION:

If *puruṣa* combines with *prakṛti* (*puruṭaṉ pirakiruti peṟṟāl*), then it will lose part of its knowledge [intelligence] (*pōtam ciṟituaṅku uṇṭāki*). Just as a lame man rides on the back of a blind man (*kuruṭaṉ mutukil mūṭavaṉ iruntu*) and they move slowly (*ūrntāṟ pōla*), [so too] *puruṣa* will guide the dark [blind] *prakṛti* (*iruḻ pirakiruti*) to experience (*iruntu iyaṅkum*) its [*puruṣa*'s] own karmic remnants (*taṉṉiṭattē kaṉmāl*). [So, *puruṣa*] is not god (*iṟaiyaṉṟu*). [He who unites them] both (*iraṇṭiṉaiyum*) and creates forms [souls] with ignorance (*maruḻtaṉ uruvāyc*

[499] *Mūlappirakiruti* - Primordial Matter, as the cause of the manifest universe. *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "mūlappirakiruti" (p. 2636)*.

cēṭṭippittu) and knows [their karmic activities] (*aṟiyum*) is Śiva (*araṉēyām*), one without any impurity (*amalaṉ*).

VERSE 263

aṟiyāṉ puruṭaṉ pirakiruti acēta ṉamkā riyattiṉukkuk
kuṟiyāy nātaṉ uḷaṉeṉṟu kūṟum mutti vivēkam eṉil
ceṟivām taḷaipō kātu aṟiyil cērttōṉ vēṇṭum ceyaliṟpōm
neṟiyāl paṇiceytu uṭalpācam nīkkik koḷnī niṉmalaṉāl.

[In this verse, the Śaiva Siddhāntin concludes his discourse as the antagonist of the Sāṁkhya school. He reiterates that Śiva is the prime force behind the activities of both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti.* Just as Śiva brought about the union between the two, he is the one who could show his grace and separate the two, liberating the soul to attain salvation].

TRANSLATION:

Puruṣa cannot know anything (*aṟiyāṉ puruṭaṉ*) [by himself] and *prakṛti* is insentient (*pirakiruti acētaṉam*). Note that Śiva (*nātaṉ*) is the First Cause for this action [creation] (*kāriyattiṉukku kuṟiyāy uḷaṉ eṉṟu*). If you say that salvation is this knowledge [that *puruṣa* is different from *prakṛtī*] (*kūṟum mutti vivēkam eṉil*), [no,] this knowledge will not eliminate the bondage of the soul (*ceṟivām taḷai pōkātu aṟiyil*). The one who united them (*cērttōṉ*) is required (*vēṇṭum*) to separate them (*ceyaliṟpōm*) [in order to release the soul]. Follow the righteous path (*neṟiyāl*), perform your [prescribed] duties (*paṇiceytu*), get rid of your bodily attachments (*uṭal pācam nīkkikkoḷ*), and [you will be graced by] the one who has no impurity (*nī niṉmalaṉāl*).

4.14A PĀÑCARĀTRA SCHOOL (*PŪRVAPAKṢIN* – VERSES 264-270)

VERSE 264

ātiyāy aruvam āki akaṇṭapū raṇamāy ñāṉac
cōtiyāy niṉṟa māyaṉ cuvēccaiyāl uruvu koṇṭu

nītiyār karuṇai yālē nīḷkaṭal tuyiṉṟu nūlum
ōtiṉāṉ eṉṟu pāñca rāttiri uraippaṉ uṟṟē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin begins his discourse as the *pūrvapakṣin* of the Pāñcarātra school.[500] The school holds that Māyaṉ [Viṣṇu][501] is one without a form[502], omnipresent, creator of the universe. He assumed several forms, exhibited compassion, and revealed the sacred treatises (Vedas)].

TRANSLATION:

Māyaṉ [Viṣṇu] is (*niṉṟa māyaṉ*) the beginning (*ātiyāy*), one without a form (*aruvam āki*), omnipresent one (*akaṇṭapūraṇamāy*), and a beacon of wisdom (*ñāṉac cōtiyāy*). He assumed forms out of his own volition (*cuvēccaiyāl uruvu koṇṭu*) with just compassion (*nītiyār karuṇai yālē*), slept in the midst of the ocean (*nīḷkaṭal tuyiṉṟu*), and composed the treatise (*nūlum ōtiṉāṉ eṉṟu*). So says the adherent of the Pāñcarātra school (*pāñcarāttiri uraippaṉ uṟṟē*).

VERSE 265

untiyil ayaṉai īṉṟum avaṉaikkoṇṭu ulaku uṇṭākki
antanal ulaku aḻikka araṉaiyum ākku vittut
tantiṭum cakatti ṉukkut titikarttā tāṉē yāki

---

[500] "Pāñcarātra ("five nights) is a Vaiṣṇava ritual and theological tradition, beginning approximately in the early centuries CE, which influenced many other Vaiṣṇava schools. In particular, it provided part of the textual, and much of the ritual basis for South Indian Śrī Vaiṣṇavism." JOHNSON 2009:230.

"*Pāñcarātra* is the name given to the tradition based on those sections of āgama scriptures devoted to Lord Nārāyaṇa. The origin of the name is disputed; the texts deal with theology, form of worship and rituals." See NARAYANAN 1987:11.

Vasudha Narayanan provides an exhaustive catalog of myths and accounts of Viṣṇu's incarnations in Appendix 2 of her title. See NARAYANAN 1987:170-174.

[501] It is interesting to note that Aruṇanti does not use the term "Viṣṇu" (Sanskrit and Tamil) or "Viṭṭuṇu" (Tamil) in the *Parapakkam*. Instead he uses "Māl," "Māyaṉ," and Nāraṇaṉ. (e-mail exchange with Dr. Katherine Young, May 2013).

[502] "Without a form" is not in line with the Vaiṣṇava thought. (e-mail exchange with Dr. Katherine Young, May 2013).

vantiṭum tōr̲ram īr̲u nilaimaiyum paṇṇum māyaṉ̲.

["According to my theology] Nārāyaṇa [Viṣṇu] creates Brahmā, through him creates the world, creates Śiva, through him dissolves the world, and takes it upon himself to protect the world. Thus he plays (directly, or indirectly) the triple role of creation, maintenance, and dissolution."].

TRANSLATION:

Begetting Brahmā from his navel (*untiyil ayaṉ̲ai īṉ̲rum*), he creates the world through him (*avaṉ̲aikkoṇṭu ulaku uṇṭākki*), [then] annihilates that fine world (*anta nal ulaku a̲likka*), creates Śiva (*araṉ̲aiyum ākku vittu*) and makes himself the protector (*tantiṭum titikarttā tāṉ̲ē yāki*) of the world (*cakattiṉ̲ukku*). [Thus,] Māyaṉ̲ [Viṣṇu] is the source (*nilaimaiyum paṇṇum māyaṉ̲*) for creation (*vantiṭum*), protection (*tōr̲ram*) and dissolution (*īr̲u*).

VERSE 266

mīṉ̲āmai kē̲al nāra ciṅkamvā maṇaṉ̲āy veṉ̲r̲i
āṉ̲āta irāmar mūvar āyaṉ̲āy a̲ḷittāṉ̲ ka̲r̲ki
tāṉ̲aiyum varuvaṉ̲ iṉ̲ṉam eṉ̲r̲uavaṉ̲ cār̲r̲it tēvar
kōṉ̲āyum ni̲r̲paṉ̲ eṉ̲r̲u kū̲r̲uvaṉ̲ ku̲r̲ippi ṉ̲ōṭē.

[Viṣṇu, the head of the celestials, appeared in this world as different incarnations[503]].

TRANSLATION:

[Viṣṇu's incarnations include] the Fish (*mīṉ̲*), Tortoise (*āmai*), Boar (*kē̲al*), Man-Lion (*nāraciṅkam*), Dwarf (*vāmaṇaṉ̲*), three victorious Rāma-s (*veṉ̲r̲i āṉ̲āta*

[503] The Pāñcarātra also gives the names twelve emanations [of Viṣṇu]: Keśava, Nārāyaṇa, Mādhava, Govinda, Viṣṇu, Madhusūdana, Trivikrama, Vāmana, Śrīdhara, Hṛṣīkeśa, Padmanābha, and Dāmodara. See NARAYANAN 1987:11.

irāmar mūvar), and Herdsman [Kṛṣṇa] (*āyaṉ*). He also stated (*eṉṟuavaṉ cāṟṟi*) his impending incarnation of the Horse (*kaṟki tāṉaiyum varuvaṉ iṉṉam*). It is also proclaimed (*kūṟuvaṉ kuṟippiṉōṭē*) that he [Viṣṇu] stays as the head of the celestials (*tēvar kōṉāyum niṟpaṉ eṉṟu*).[504]

VERSE 267

ēḻkaṭal celuvil ēṟṟum iruṅkiri mutukil ēṟṟum
tāḻtalam muḻutum kaṇṭum tapaṉiyaṉ uṭalpi ḷantum
vāḻulaku aḷantum maṉṉāy maṉṉarkku maṉṉarāyum
pāḻpaṭa uḻaṟip pārum nōkkumpiṉ pariyum āvē.

[The incarnations are elaborated].

TRANSLATION:

Nārāyaṇa [Viṣṇu] endured the seven seas in his gill [as Fish] (*ēḻkaṭal celuvil ēṟṟum*), supported the mountain on his back [as Tortoise] (*iruṅkiri mutukil ēṟṟum*), found the earth that was submerged in water [as Boar] (*tāḻtalam muḻutum kaṇṭum*), split the body of Hiraṇya [as Man-Lion] (*tapaṉiyaṉ uṭal piḷantum*), and measured the three worlds [as Dwarf] (*vāḻulaku aḷantum*). He became the king of kings [as the three Rāmā-s] (*maṉṉarkku maṉṉarāyum*), protected the earth (*pārum nōkkum*) by killing demons [appearing as Kṛṣṇa] (*pāḻpaṭa uḻaṟi*), and will appear in the future as the Horse (*piṉ pariyum āvē*).

VERSE 268

poykaivāy mutalai vāyil pōtakam pōta māṭṭātu

---

[504] "The Āḻvārs frequently mention the various incarnations of Viṣṇu, but the lists differ. Tirumaṅkai mentions the descents as a fish, as a tortoise, a boar, a lion-man, a dwarf (Vāmana), a man with an axe (Paraśurāma), Rāma, a swan, and Kṛṣṇa (*Periya Tirumoḻi 11.4.1-10*). But in an earlier set of verses, he lists a different set of ten incarnations; in later generations this list becomes the "official" one: the fish, tortoise, boar, lion [*sic*], dwarf, Paraśurāma, Rāma, Balarāma, Kṛṣṇa, and Kalki (*Periya Tirumoḻi 8.8.1-10*)." See NARAYANAN 1987:22.

aiyaṉē nātā āti mūlamē eṉṟu aḻaippa
uyya yām paṇimāl ōlam ōlameṉṟu ōṭicceṉṟu
veyyavāy mutalai vīṭṭik karikkumvīṭu aruḷi ṉāṉē.

["Viṣṇu is so compassionate that when he saved the elephant that was caught in the jaws of the crocodile, he took both the elephant and the ferocious crocodile to his abode].

TRANSLATION:

When the elephant calf (*pōtakam*) was caught in the jaws of the crocodile (*mutalai vāyil*) in the pond (*poykai*) and could not extricate itself (*pōta māṭṭātu*), he cried out [to Māl (Viṣṇu) for help] (*eṉṟu aḻaippa*) as "Lord, my father, the First-Cause" (*aiyaṉē nātā āti mūlamē*). Māl [Viṣṇu], to whom we pray for salvation (*uyyayām paṇi māl*), responded to the cries of distress (*ōlam ōlameṉṟu*), swiftly went there (*ōṭic ceṉṟu*), killed the ferocious crocodile (*veyyavāy mutalai vīṭṭi*), and took both the elephant and the crocodile to his abode (*karikkum vīṭu aruḷi ṉāṉē*).

VERSE 269

alaikaṭal kaṭaintum vāṉōrkku amutiṉai aḻittum tīya
kolaipuri acurar tammaik koṉṟuula kaṅkaḷ kāttum
kalaimali poruḷaṉ parkkuk karuṇaiyāl uraittum mikka
talaimaiyil niṟpaṉ māyaṉ eṉṟumpiṉ cāṟṟi ṉāṉē.

[The Pāñcarātrin points out how Māyaṉ (Viṣṇu) churned the ocean and offered the nectar to the celestials, and how he vanquished the demons and saved the worlds. He was compassionate to his followers and explained to them the intricacies of the treatises. According to the Pāñcarātrin, Māyaṉ is the Supreme Lord].

TRANSLATION:

He churned the ocean (*alaikaṭal kaṭaintum*), [produced the divine nectar of

immortality] (*amutiṉai*), offered it to the celestials (*vāṉōrkku aḷittum*), annihilated (*koṉṟu*) the evil murderous demons (*tīya kolaipuri acurar tammaik*), and protected the worlds (*ulakaṅkaḷ kāttum*). Out of his compassion (*karuṇaiyāl*), he explained the meaning (*poruḷ uraittum*) of the treatises (*kalaimali*) to his devotees (*aṉparkku*). Thus it is stated (*eṉṟumpiṉ cāṟṟi ṉāṉē*) that Māyaṉ [Viṣṇu] (*māyaṉ*) stands above all [as the Supreme] (*mikka talaimaiyil niṟpaṉ*).

VERSE 270

māyaiyāy uyirāy māyā kāriyam āki maṉṉi
māyaiyāl pantam ceytu vāṅkiṭum avaṉāl aṉṟi
māyaipō kātueṉṟu eṇṇi māyaṉai vaṇaṅkap piṉṉai
māyaipōm pōṉāl māyaṉ vaikuṇṭam vaippaṉ aṉṟē.

[Worshipping Viṣṇu will allow one to remove the effects caused by *māyā* and reach his abode].

TRANSLATION:

[Viṣṇu] appears as *māyā* (*māyaiyāy*), as souls (*uyirāy*) and as the product of *māyā* (*māyā kāriyam āki maṉṉi*). *Māyai* (*māyā*)[505] causes the earthly attachments (*māyaiyāl pantam ceytu*), and only he [Viṣṇu] can remove the effects caused by *māyā* (*vāṅkiṭum avaṉāl aṉṟi māyaipōkātu*). With such belief (*eṉṟu eṇṇi*), if one worships Māyaṉ [Viṣṇu] (*māyaṉai vaṇaṅka*), *māyā* will disappear (*piṉṉai māyaipōm*) and when it disappears (*pōṉāl*), Māyaṉ [Viṣṇu] (*māyaṉ*) will take one to Vaikuṇṭam [his heavenly abode] (*vaikuṇṭam vaippaṉ aṉṟē*).

[505] Aruṇanti, either intentionally (for alliteration?) or unintentionally, uses "*māyai*" (*māyā*), and Māyaṉ (Viṣṇu), almost interchangeably in this verse. Notice the clever use of the words, all in the same verse: *māyaiyāy*, *māyākāriyam*, *māyaiyāl*, *māyaipōkātu*, *māyaṉai*, *māyaipōmpōṉāl*, and *māyaṉ*.

4.14B PĀÑCARĀTRA SCHOOL (*SIDDHĀNTIN* – VERSES 271-301)

VERSE 271

ātitāṉ ākil ātikku antamuṇ ṭākum antak
kōtilāṉ iṟaivaṉ eṉṟu kūṟiṭum vētam ñāṉac
cōtiyāy niṉṟāṉ ākil tōyntiṭāṉ māyai ñāṉat
tītilā uruvam eṉṉil cērntiṭāṉ tātuc ceṉṟē.

[The Pāñcarātrin begins, "If MāyaṉṈ (Viṣṇu) has a beginning, he must also have an end. However, the Vedas declare that the creator is eternal, with neither a beginning nor an end. If he appeared as a beacon of wisdom, how did he assume forms in the world during his incarnations, which are made up of perishable constituent elements?].

TRANSLATION:

If he was the beginning (*ātitāṉ ākil*), then the beginning will have an end (*ātikku antam uṇṭākum*). The Vedas declare (*kūṟiṭum vētam*) that god (*iṟaivaṉ*) is without a beginning and without an end (*antak kōtilāṉ eṉṟu*). If he appears as a beacon wisdom (*ñāṉac cōtiyāy niṉṟāṉ ākil*), then he will not be affected by *māyā* (*tōyntiṭāṉ māyai*). If you say that he is the embodiment of untainted wisdom (*ñāṉat tītilā uruvam eṉṉil*), then he will not have [a body] an aggregate of elements (*cērntiṭāṉ tātuc ceṉṟē*).

VERSE 272

tātuvā ṉatuētu eṉṉil caṅkaraṉ palikkuc cellat
tītilāk kōtaṇ ṭattait tiṟantuavaṉ viṭṭa pōtu
pōtuvatu utiram aṉṟō pōntumūrc cittu vīṟntāṉ
nātaṉār eṟuppap piṉṉē naṭantaṉaṉ kiṭanta vaṉtāṉ.

[To point out that Viṣṇu was made up of perishable constituent elements,[506] the Pāñcarātrin relates the incident when Śiva revived Viṣṇu after he had fainted following some loss of blood].

TRANSLATION:

To the question if he [Viṣṇu] assumed the elements of the human body (*tātuvāṉatu ētu eṉṉil*), [the answer is]: When Śaṅkara [Śiva] went as a mendicant (*caṅkaraṉ palikkuc cella*),[507] he [Viṣṇu] opened his forehead (*tītilāk kōtaṇṭattait tiṟantuavaṉ*) and released blood [to fill the begging bowl] (*viṭṭa pōtu pōtuvatu utiram aṉṟō*), [as a result of which] he [Viṣṇu] became unconscious and fell down (*pōntu mūrccittu vīḻntāṉ*). Śiva revived him (*nātaṉār eḻuppa*) and he [Viṣṇu], who had fallen down (*kiṭanta vaṉtāṉ*), walked behind Śiva (*piṉṉē naṭantaṉaṉ*).

VERSE 273

iccaiyāl uruvam koḷvaṉ arieṉil ikaḻvēḷ vikkaṇ
eccaṉāy uṇṇap pukku aṅku irunta aṉṟu īca ṉālē
accamār talai aṟuppu uṇṭu āṉtalai ākkik koḷḷāṉ
nacciṉār pōṟṟa nātaṉ nāraṇaṉ talaiko ṭuttāṉ.

[The Pāñcarātrin relates another incident when Viṣṇu was beheaded by Śiva, and later at the behest of the assembled celestials restored the head.[508] The

---

[506] The human body is an aggregate of elements like blood, bones, flesh etc.

[507] Refers to a *Purāṇic* account. The *Kūrma Purāṇa* has several accounts involving Śiva. In one account, Śiva entered Viṣṇu's abode in the Deodar Forest and begged for food, and Viṣṇu offered his own blood as food. In another version, Viṣṇu cut off an artery on Śiva's forehead, and a stream of blood spurts into his begging bowl as his food. The sight of blood causes Viṣṇu to faint. For several versions of this incident, see KRAMRISCH 1981:289-292.

[508] This refers to a *Purāṇic* account. Takkan organized a sacrifice where Śiva was not invited, and Viṣṇu was present as the chief guest. Pārvatī was furious at the insult and hence approached Siva, and requested that the sacrificial place be cursed and changed into cremation grounds. Śiva appeared at the sacrifice as Vīrabhadra and in a ferocious manner beheaded several celestials including Viṣṇu. Later at the behest of the assembled participants at the sacrifice, Śiva restored Viṣṇu's head. See MUDALIAR 1988:767-768.

"The Prajāpati (progenitor) Dakṣa, father of Śiva's wife Satī, performed a great sacrifice to

anecdote proves that Viṣṇu cannot assume forms on his own].

TRANSLATION:

You say Ari [Hari for Viṣṇu] (ari) assumes a form (*uruvam koḷvaṉ eṉil*) out of his volition (*iccaiyāl*). When he went to eat and participate in that spiteful sacrifice (*uṇṇappukku eccaṉāy ikaḷ vēḷvikkaṇ*), his [Viṣṇu's] head was severed (*talai aṟuppu uṇṭu*) in a frightful manner (*accamār*), and he could not create his own head (*āṉtalai ākkik koḷḷāṉ*). That day Śiva was there (*aṅku irunta aṉṟu īcaṉ*) and at the request of the celestial beings (*nacciṉār pōṟṟa*), Śiva (*nātaṉ*) restored the head of Nārāyaṇa [Viṣṇu] (*nāraṇaṉ talai koṭuttāṉ*).

VERSE 274

nūliṉai uraittu vēta nūliṉai nuvalum vaṇṇam
māl aruḷ ceytāṉ eṉṟāy maṟainīti ulaki yaṟkai
cālavē teriyā tākik kiṭantanāḷ cakattu yārkkum
āliṉkīḻ iruntu vētam aruḷiṉāṉ aṟaintāṉ nūlē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin tells the Pāñcarātrin that Śiva in fact, revealed the Vedas under a banyan tree, and his teachings showed the righteous path to his followers. Māl (Viṣṇu) as advocated did not reveal them by the Pāñcarātrin].

TRANSLATION:

You say that (*ceytāṉ eṉṟāy*) Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*) authored the Vedas (*nūliṉai uraittu*) and with his benevolence (*aruḷ*) also explained their meanings (*vēta nūliṉai*

---

which he invited all the gods except his son-in-law Śiva. When Satī went to the sacrifice, Dakṣa insulted Śiva to her face. Unable to bear the insult, Satī immolated herself. Crazed with grief and anger, Śiva—as Vīrabhadra, or through the agency of Vīrabhadra—destroyed Dakṣa's sacrifice and mutilated the various gods who had come to the sacrifice. He cut off Dakṣa's head and replaced it with that of a goat." See PETERSON 1989:345.

nuvalum vaṇṇam). Śiva graced us with the Vedas (*vētam aruḷiṉāṉ*) and explained them (*aṟaintāṉ nūlē*) under a banyan tree (*āliṉkīḻ iruntu*) when the whole world (*cakattu yārkkum*) was [confused], without knowing the righteous path (*cālavē teriyātāki*) and the nature of the world (*ulakiyaṟkai*), as explained in the Vedas (*kiṭanta maṟainīti*).

VERSE 275

ayaṉtaṉaip payantāṉ eṉṟāy ariayaṉ ciramcē tippap
payantiṭāṉ talai māl tāṉum paṭaittiṭāṉ cirattaik kiḷḷum
cayamtarum araṉait tantāṉ ayaṉeṉkai tappē aṉṟō
tiyaṅkiṭātu uṇarāy ellām civaṉceyal eṉṟu tērntē.

["You hold that Ari (Viṣṇu) begot Brahmā and when Brahmā's head was plucked away by Śiva, Viṣṇu could not restore the head.[509] You are wrong in stating that Brahmā begot Śiva. Get rid of your confusion and understand that every act is according to the will of Śiva"].

TRANSLATION:

You said that (*eṉṟāy*) Ari [Hari] (*ari*) created Brahmā (*ayaṉtaṉaip payantāṉ*). When Brahmā's head was cut off [by Śiva] (*ayaṉ ciram cētippa*), Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*) was fearful (*payantiṭāṉ*) and could not create a head (*talai tāṉum paṭaittiṭāṉ*). Is it not erroneous to say (*eṉkai tappē aṉṟō*) that Brahmā (tantāṉ ayaṉ) begot victorious Śiva (cayam tarum araṉ) who severed [Brahmā's] head (cirattaik kiḷḷum)? Without any confusion (*tiyaṅkiṭātu*), understand that (*uṇarāy*) Śiva does everything (*ellām civaṉ ceyal eṉṟu*).

VERSE 276

---

[509] According to another Puranic episode, the five-faced Brahmā was conceited that he was also five-faced just like Śiva. To teach him humility, Śiva plucked away the fifth head. Viṣṇu could not undo the damage and was a silent witness. See MUTTAPPAN 2003:215.

cīvarkaḷ caṉaṉam pōlac cilarvayiṟṟu utitta mālait
tēvueṉṟē vaiyam kākkac cuvēccaiyāl ceṉittāṉ eṉpāy
pūvaṉ piṉ paṭaikka māṭṭātu araṇaṭi pōṟṟa vētak
kōvantu mukattil tōṉṟic ciruṭṭiyaik koṭuttal kūṟum.

["Contrary to what you say, Viṣṇu was born out of a womb like mortals and did not create himself. After the great deluge, Brahmā was unable to create the world, and it was Śiva who taught Brahmā how to create the world"].

TRANSLATION:

You say that (*eṉpāy*) Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*), who was born out of a womb (*vayiṟṟu utitta*) like many souls (*cīvarkaḷ caṉaṉam pōlac cilar*), is the godhead (*tēvu eṉṟē*) and appeared out of his own volition (*cuvēccaiyāl ceṉittāṉ*) to protect the world (*vaiyam kākka*). The Lotus-born [Brahmā] (*pūvaṉ*) was unable to create the world [after the great deluge] (*piṉ paṭaikka māṭṭātu*) and prayed to Śiva (*araṇaṭi pōṟṟa*). The Lord of the Vedas [Śiva] (*vētakkō*) appeared on the forehead (*mukattil tōṉṟi*) [of Brahmā] and taught him the art of creation (*ciruṭṭiyaik koṭuttal*). Thus, it is said [in many *Purāṇic* stories] (*kūṟum*).

VERSE 277

nāraṇaṉ ayaṉai īṉṟum ayaṉumnā raṇaṉai īṉṟum
kāraṇam oruva rukkuaṅku oruvartām iruva rukkum
vāraṇam uritta vaḷḷal kāraṇaṉ eṉṟu maṉṟa
āraṇam uraikkum pakkattu avarkaḷum aṭaintār aṉṟē.

["According to you, Brahmā created Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu), and Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) created Brahmā. This is impossible. The Vedas with certainty declare that Śiva who sports an elephant hide is the First Cause and he absorbed both Brahmā and Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) on either side of him].

TRANSLATION:

Nāraṇaṉ [Viṣṇu] created Brahmā (*nāraṇaṉ ayaṉai īṉṟum*), and Brahmā created Nāraṇaṉ [Viṣṇu] (*ayaṉum nāraṇaṉai īṉṟum*). Thus, each is the cause for the other (*kāraṇam oruvarukku aṅku oruvar tām*). The great benefactor (*vaḷḷal*) who tore off the hide of the elephant [elephant-demon] (*vāraṇam uritta*) [Śiva] is the First Cause (*kāraṇaṉ eṉṟu*) for both of them (*iruvarukkum*), as declared by the Vedas with certainty (*maṉṟa āraṇam uraikkum*). [Know that] they both (*avarkaḷum*) have merged (*aṭaintār aṉṟē*) on either side (*pakkattu*) [of Śiva].

VERSE 278

aḻippuari ēval eṉṟāy aritaṉai aḻikkum aṉṟuaṅku
aḻippatu tavirkka māṭṭāṉ aṅkamum aḻittē pūṇṭāṉ
aḻippuari ēval eṉṟuaṅku aṟaintatum aḻintatu aṉṟō
aḻittiṭum araṉē ākkam nōkkamum ākku vāṉē.

["During Śiva's dissolution of the world, both Brahmā and Viṣṇu cannot prevent their death. Know that Śiva sports many relics including the destroyed organs of Viṣṇu. Śiva is the only creator, custodian, and dissolver of the world"].

TRANSLATION:

You said that the act of dissolution is the command of Hari [Viṣṇu] [to Śiva] (*aḻippu ari ēval eṉṟāy*). Therefore, he [Viṣṇu] cannot prevent his own destruction (*aḻippatu tavirkka māṭṭāṉ*) at the end of Śiva's dissolution (*aritaṉai aḻikkum aṉṟu aṅku*). Śiva wears many of the destroyed organs [as relics, after the demise of Viṣṇu] (*aṅkamum aḻittē pūṇṭāṉ*). Your statement that dissolution is Hari's [Viṣṇu's] command (*aḻippu ari ēval eṉṟuaṅku aṟaintatum*) is also destroyed [meaningless] (*aḻintatu aṉṟō*). Śiva, who dissolves the world (*aḻittiṭum araṉē*) also creates and develops the world (*ākkam nōkkamum ākku vāṉē*).

VERSE 279

vāṉamkīḻ maṇṇum ellām māyaṉē kāppāṉ eṉṟāy
tāṉ añcum calanta raṉṟaṉ uṭalkīṇṭa cakka rattai

āṉañcum āṭu vāṉpāl peṟṟuulaku aḷitta vārttai
tāṉeṅkum ākum ellām caṅkaraṉ kāppē āmē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin points out how when the demon Jalandhara threatened Viṣṇu, he could not protect himself and Śiva came to his rescue and killed Jalandhara with a discus.[510] After repeated requests, eventually Viṣṇu received that discus from Śiva and with it started protecting the world from the demons. Hence, to say that Māyaṉ (Viṣṇu) protects the world is tantamount to saying that Śiva protects the world].

TRANSLATION:

You said (*eṉṟāy*) that Māyaṉ [Viṣṇu] (*māyaṉ*) protects (*kāppāṉ*) the celestial world (*vāṉam*), the nether world (*kīḻ*), and also the earth (*maṇṇum ellām*). To protect the world (*ulaku aḷitta*), Māyaṉ [Viṣṇu] received the discus (*cakkarattai peṟṟu*) from the dancer [Śiva] (*āṭuvāṉ*) which [Śiva had used to] cleave the body (*uṭal kīṇṭa*) of one Calandaraṉ [Jalandhara] of whom he [Viṣṇu] was afraid (*tāṉ añcum calantaraṉṟaṉ*). This incident is well known everywhere (*vārttai tāṉeṅkum ākum*). The protection [of the world] is all due to Śiva (*ellām caṅkaraṉ kāppē āmē*).

VERSE 280

māliṉār cēli ṉārāy vārikaḷ aṭakkik koṇṭu aṉṟu
āliyā ulakam ellām aḷippavaṉ nāṉē eṉṉac
cēliṉār tamaip piṭittuc celuviṉai iṭantu kaṇṇaic
cūliyār mēl aṇintāṉ cūlitāṉ ākum aṉṟē.

["You say that Māl (Viṣṇu) appeared in his incarnation as a fish to protect the

[510] "...Śiva's gift of the wheel (cakra) to Viṣṇu, who thereafter adopted it as one of his four attributes. According to the Śaivas, Viṣṇu could kill the demon Jalandhara only after he had worshiped Śiva at one of his shrines and obtained the wheel from him." See PETERSON 1989:193-194.

world. The fact that Śiva speared the fish, severed its gills and eyes, and decorated his trident with them demonstrates Śiva's prowess"].

TRANSLATION:

When Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*) appeared in his incarnation as a fish (*cēliṉārāy*), he carried the [seven] oceans in his gill (*vārikaḷ aṭakkik koṇṭu*) and proclaimed himself (*nāṉē eṉṉa*) to be the destructive force (*aḻippavaṉ*) of the whole world (*ulakam ellām*). To restrain [Viṣṇu's] pride (*cēliṉār tamaip piṭittu*), the carrier of the trident [Śiva] (*cūlitāṉ ākum aṉṟē*) speared the eyes and gills (*celuviṉai iṭantu kaṇṇai*) and decorated his trident with them (*cūliyār mēl aṇintāṉ*).

VERSE 281

āmaiyāy mērut tāṅki aṭai kalāyk kiṭanta pōtu
nāmeṉā ulaku ātāra nātaṉeṉṟu akantai paṇṇa
āmeṉār aṉṟum eṉṉār amararum araṉār pārttut
tāmanāḷ āmai yārait takarttuōṭu tarittār aṉṟē.

["Similarly, when Viṣṇu appeared in his incarnation as a tortoise and became very conceited that he was protector of the world, Śiva taught him a lesson. He tore open the tortoise and sported the shell as a medal"].

TRANSLATION:

Appearing as a tortoise (*āmaiyāy*) [in his incarnation, Viṣṇu] shouldered Meru mountain (*mērut tāṅki*) and supported it (*aṭaikalāyk kiṭanta pōtu*). He became too conceited (*akantai paṇṇa*) that he was the god of protection of the world (*nāmeṉā ulaku ātāra nātaṉ eṉṟu*). The celestials (*amararum*) neither approved (*āmeṉār*) nor disapproved (*aṉṟum eṉṉār*) [Viṣṇu's attitude] but Śiva (*araṉār*), looking on (*pārttuttām*), tore open the tortoise (*āmaiyārait takarttu*) and wore the shell [as a medal] (*ōṭu tarittār*).

VERSE 282

eḻutalam iṭantu paṉṟi yāyiruṅ kompil ēṟṟut
toḻutuulaku iṟaiñca niṉṟa cōtināṉ eṉṟa pōtuaṉṟu
aḻutuala mantu vīḻa aruṅkōṭu paṟittu aṇintāṉ
kaḻutuala manta kāṭṭil āṭiṭum kaṭavuḷ aṉṟē.

["When Viṣṇu appeared as a boar in his incarnation, to quell his conceit Śiva tore his tusk away and sported it as a medal"].

TRANSLATION:

Appearing as a boar (*paṉṟiyāy*) [in his incarnation, Viṣṇu] retrieved the seven worlds (*eḻutalam iṭantu*) [from the ocean and] carried them on his single tusk (*iruṅ kompil ēṟṟut*). The world worshipped him for his valor (*toḻutu ulaku iṟaiñca*), which made him proclaim (*eṉṟa pōtu*) that he was the sole supreme power (*niṉṟa cōti nāṉ*). Our god (*kaṭavuḷ aṉṟē*) [Śiva], who dances [with joy] in the fields frequented by ghosts [burial grounds] (*kaḻutuala manta kāṭṭil*), tore his [Viṣṇu's] tusk away (*aruṅkōṭu paṟittu*), making him fall down in distress (*aḻutuala mantu vīḻa*). [Śiva] wore the tusk (*aṇintāṉ*) [as a medal].

VERSE 283

iṅkuaṭā uḷaṉō māleṉṟu iraṇiyaṉ tūṇai eṟṟa
uṅkaḷtā mōta raṉtāṉ urunara ciṅka māki
eṅkaṭā pōvatu eṉṉā uṭalpiḷantu iṟai yāṉ eṉṉa
aṅkaṭā cimpu ḷāki eṭuttuaṭart tāṉ araṉtāṉ.

["When Viṣṇu appeared as a man-lion in his incarnation and displayed extreme pride, Śiva appeared as a bird, and destroyed him"].

TRANSLATION:

When Hiraṇya (*iraṇiyaṉ*) kicked the pillar (*tūṇai eṟṟa*) asking if Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*) was in there (*iṅkuaṭā uḷaṉō eṉṟu*), it was your Dāmodara [Viṣṇu] (*uṅkaḷ tāmōtaraṉ tāṉ*) who appeared as the Man-Lion (*uru naraciṅkam āki*) and saying "where can

you go" (*eṅkaṭā pōvatu eṉṉā*) split his body in two (*uṭal piḷantu*) and called himself "god" (*iṟai yāṉ eṉṉa*). [To subdue his pride], Śiva (*araṉtāṉ*) appeared there as a bird (*aṅkaṭā cimpuḷ āki*), lifted him [Viṣṇu] up (*eṭuttu*) and subdued [his pride] (*aṭarttāṉ*).

VERSE 284

tāṉameṉṟu irantu cellat taṉakkumū vaṭikō ṭuppa
vāṉamum aḷantu koṇṭu māvali taṉṉaip piṉṉai
īṉamām ciṟaiyil iṭṭāṉ iṟaiyaṉṟuoṉṟu īntōr taṅkaṭku
ūṉamcey tiṭuvōr tāṅkaḷ uttamar allar ākum.

["When Vāmana [Viṣṇu] appeared as a dwarf in his incarnation, he was ungrateful to the king who had given him land as charity, and tortured him.[511] Such behavior is not worthy of worship as a god"].

TRANSLATION:

When he went begging for alms (*tāṉam eṉṟu irantu cella*), Mahābali (*māvali*) gave him three-stride-long land as requested (*taṉakku mūvaṭi koṭuppa*). Vāmana [Viṣṇu] took the [earth and the] sky with two strides (*vāṉamum aḷantu koṇṭu taṉṉai*), [and with no room for the third stride, pinned Bali's] head down (*piṉṉai*). [with his foot]. He [then] imprisoned him in a degrading manner (*īṉamām ciṟaiyil iṭṭāṉ*). [Such a person] cannot be a god (*iṟaiyaṉṟu*). One who hurts (*ūṉam ceytiṭuvōr tāṅkaḷ*) a person who has been his benefactor (*oṉṟu īntōr taṅkaṭku*) cannot be called (*allar ākum*) a person of sterling character (*uttamar*).

VERSE 285

māyamāṉ taṉṉaip poymmāṉ eṉaaṟi yātu arakkaṉ

[511] "Viṣṇu, disguised as a dwarf, came to a sacrifice conducted by the demon king Bali. He begged for three paces of land from Bali and was granted them. Viṣṇu then rose into the sky and with three steps strove the universe. […], Viṣṇu took his third step by placing his foot on Bali's head." See NARAYANAN 1987:170.

mayaiyil akappaṭ ṭuttaṉ maṉaiviyaik koṭuttāṉ taṉṉai
māyaikkuk karttā eṉpai matiketṭuaṅku avaṉaik koṉṟu
nāyaṉār tamaip pūcittāṉ kolaippāvam naṇuki ṭāmē.

["When Viṣṇu appeared as Rāma he was duped by Rāvaṇa and lost his wife. Do you call such a gullible person as your creator? Remember that when Rāma killed Rāvaṇa, he atoned for his sins by worshipping Śiva].

TRANSLATION:

Not realizing (*eṉa aṟiyātu*) that the illusory deer (*māyamāṉ taṉṉai*) was a deceitful deer (*poymmāṉ*), he [Rāma] was trapped by the demon's *māyā* (*arakkaṉ mayaiyil akappaṭṭu*) and lost his wife (*taṉ maṉaiviyaik koṭuttāṉ*). Do you call him (*taṉṉai*) the creator of *māyā* (*māyaikkuk karttā eṉpai*)? Tormented (*matiketṭu*) [because of his loss], he killed him [Rāvaṇa] (*aṅku avaṉaik koṉṟu*). Not to be affected by the sins of murder (*kolaippāvam naṇuki ṭāmē*), he worshipped Nāyaṉār [Śiva] (*nāyaṉār tamaip pūcittāṉ*).

VERSE 286

paracuṭaṉ piṟantāṉ tāṉum pattaṉāyp paraci ṉālē
aracuaṟuttu araṉai nōkki aruntavam purintāṉ aṉṟu
paraciya paracu rāmaṉ palatēvaṉ ulakam ellām
uraiceyum umaiyāḷ kōṉai uḷniṉaintu yōkil niṉṟāṉ.

["In the other two incarnations as Paraśurāma and Balarāma, Viṣṇu performed austerities to Śiva who is worshipped by the whole world"].

TRANSLATION:

The much commended Paraśurāma (*paraciya paracurāmaṉ*) was born wielding an ax (*paracuṭaṉ piṟantāṉ*), and he was a devotee [of Śiva] (*tāṉum pattaṉāy*). He killed many kings (*aracu aṟuttu*) with his ax (*paraci ṉālē*), performed great austerities, and worshipped Śiva (*araṉai nōkki aruntavam purintāṉ*). [Also],

Balarāma (*palatēvaṉ*) stayed in yogic posture (*yōkil niṉṟāṉ*) and concentrated (*uḷniṉaintu*) on Uma's consort (*umaiyāḷ kōṉai*) [Śiva] who is worshipped (*uraiceyum*) by the whole world (*ulakam ellām*).

VERSE 287

ōtiya vācu tēvar tamaiupa maṉiyu tēvar
tītilā nōkkam ceytu civakaram cirattil cērtti
ātipāl aṭimai ākka ariuṭal pirāṇaṉ attam
ītelām koḷnī eṉṟuaṅku iṟaiñciṉār aṟinti ṭāyē.

["When Viṣṇu appeared as Kṛṣṇa in his incarnation, he requested sage Upamanyu to initiate him in the worship of Śiva. Know that, after sage Upamanyu initiated him, Kṛṣṇa offered his body, soul, and wealth to Śiva (through his teacher)].

TRANSLATION:

When Vāsudeva [Kṛṣṇa] spoke to him (*ōtiya vācutēvar*), Upamanyu Deva (*upamaṉiyu tēvar*) looked at him gracefully with his mind's eye (*tamai tītilā nōkkam ceytu*), placed his sacred hand (*civakaram*) on the crown of his [Kṛṣṇa's] head (*cirattil cērtti*) [in a benedictory fashion], and made him a follower of Śiva (*ātipāl aṭimai ākka*). Know that (*aṟintiṭāyē*) Hari [Viṣṇu] (*ari*) then begged Śiva (*eṉṟuaṅku iṟaiñciṉār*) to accept (*ītelām koḷnī*) his body, soul, and wealth (*uṭal pirāṇaṉ attam*) [as offering].

VERSE 288

piṉvarum paritāṉ āki arieṉṟāy piṉpu vantāl
eṉvarum īca ṉāleṉṟu aṟikilōm ivuḷi yārkku
muṉvarum avatā raṅkaḷ muṭintamai aṟintāy aṉṟē
poṉvarum caṭaiyi ṉāṉtaṉ pukaḻeṅkum pukkatu aṉṟē.

["We know the outcome of all those incarnations of Hari (Viṣṇu) that have taken

place, but we do not know what will happen to Viṣṇu in his yet to happen incarnation as a horse. The glory of Śiva is known far and wide"].

TRANSLATION:

You said (*eṉṟāy*) that Hari [Viṣṇu] (*ari*) will appear as a horse [in an incarnation yet to happen] (*piṉ varum paritāṉ āki*). You know the outcome (*muṭintamai aṟintāy aṉṟē*) of all the previous incarnations (*muṉvarum avatā raṅkaḷ*). However, we do not know (*eṉṟu aṟikilōm*) what Śiva will do (*eṉvarum īcaṉāl*) to the horse (*ivuḷi yārkku*) in the yet to come [incarnation] (*piṉpu vantāl*). The fame (*pukaḻ*) of the one with golden locks of hair [Śiva] (*poṉ varum caṭaiyiṉāṉ taṉ*) is well established everywhere (*eṅkum pukkatu aṉṟē*).

VERSE 289

kaivarai mūla mēyō eṉakkarikku utavum kāṭṭiṉ
moyvarai eṭuttāṉ mūlam āyiṭa vēṇṭu mōtāṉ
aiyaṉē muṟaiyō eṉṟāl aracaṉō aṅkuc celvāṉ
vaiyakam kāppāṉ celkai vaḻakkuaṉṟō ūrkāp pāṉpōl.

["When Viṣṇu responded to calls for help, he did so under the dictate of Śiva. It is similar to a city sentinel responding to calls for help from citizens even if they shout for help by naming the king].

TRANSLATION:

When the elephant (*karikku*) [called out for] the "First Cause" (*mūlamēyō eṉa*) [Viṣṇu] went to] help (*utavum*). [Also, just because] he saved the herd of cows in the forest (*kāṭṭiṉ moyvarai eṭuttāṉ*) should he become the First Cause (*mūlam āyiṭa vēṇṭumō tāṉ*)? [When someone shouts for help] by naming the king (*aiyaṉē muṟaiyō eṉṟāl*), the king does not go there [to help] (*aracaṉō aṅkuc celvāṉ*), but the city sentinel does (*ūr kāppāṉ pōl*). [Similarly, though Viṣṇu went to help, Śiva is still] the protector of the world (*vaiyakam kāppāṉ*).

VERSE 290

aṉṟiyum yāṉai mālukku aṭimaiyāy mūla mēyō
eṉṟiṭum ataṉāl māltāṉ iṟaivaṉ eṉṟu iyampa vēṇṭā
uṉṟaṉakku aṭimai āṉār uṉṉaiem perumāṉ eṉṟāl
iṉṟinī vaṇaṅkum uṉṟaṉ emperu māṉō nīyē.

["Just because the elephant cried for help calling out "the First Cause," does it make Viṣṇu the First Cause? If your servant addresses you as 'my lord,' do you become Viṣṇu whom you worship?"].

TRANSLATION:

The elephant (*yāṉai*) called out [to Viṣṇu] as the "First Cause" (*mūlamēyō eṉṟiṭum*) [because the elephant is a] vassal of Māl [Viṣṇu] (*mālukku aṭimaiyāy*). Therefore (*ataṉāl*), Māl [Viṣṇu] need not be called (*iyampa vēṇṭā*) the god (*iṟaivaṉ eṉṟu*). If your vassal (*uṉṟaṉakku aṭimai āṉār*) calls you "My Lord" [Viṣṇu] (*uṉṉai emperumāṉ eṉṟāl*), will you become "My [His] Lord" [Viṣṇu] (*emperumāṉō nīyē*), whom you worship (*nī vaṇaṅkum uṉṟaṉ*)?

VERSE 291

ñālamuṇ ṭavaṉāl uṇṭār nallamutu amarar eṉṟāy
vēlainañcu eḻa mālāti viṇṇavar ventu ceṉṟa
kālamiṉṟu emakkuk kāvāy kaṭavuḷē eṉṉa nātaṉ
ālamuṇ ṭilaṉēl tēvar amutamuṇ ṭiṭuvatu eṅkē.

["You claim that Viṣṇu in his incarnation as Kṛṣṇa swallowed the earth to save the celestials. Before that happened, if Śiva had not eaten the deadly poison that arose from the ocean, the celestials could not have eaten the nectar"].

TRANSLATION:

You said that (*eṉṟāy*) because [of the help offered by the] one who ate the earth [Viṣṇu] (*ñālam uṇṭavaṉāl*), the celestials ate the nectar of immortality (*uṇṭār*

nallamutu amarar). [Before that happened,] when the deadly poison appeared from the ocean (*vēlai nañcu eḻa*), Māl [Viṣṇu] and other celestials (*māl āti viṇṇavar*) [could not bear the] heat (*ventu*) and [prayed to Śiva] "god! (*kaṭavuḷē*) Please protect us (*emakkuk kāvāy*) from untimely death (*ceṉṟa kālam iṉṟu eṉṉa*)". If Śiva did not swallow the poison (*nātaṉ ālamuṇ ṭilaṉēl*), how could the celestials have eaten the nectar of immortality (*tēvar amutam uṇṭiṭuvatu eṅkē*)?

VERSE 292

añciaṉṟu aritāṉ ōṭa acuraṉaik kumara ṉālē
tuñcuvittu orupeṇ ṇālē tārakaṉ uṭaltu ṇippittu
añciṭap puramtī yūṭṭic calantaraṉ uṭalkīṇṭu ōta
nañciṉai uṇṭum aṉṟō nāyakaṉ ulakam kāttāṉ.

["Śiva commissioned his son Murukaṉ to destroy the demon[512] Sūrapadman, commissioned his consort Kāli to kill the demon Tārakāśura.[513] To allay Viṣṇu's fears he burnt down Tirupuram, a haven for demons.[514] He vanquished the demon Jalandara to protect Viṣṇu, and swallowed the poison to protect the world. Such are Śiva's attributes to protect the world"].

TRANSLATION:

When Viṣṇu (*ari*) was fearful (*añciaṉṟu*) of the demon (*acuraṉ*) he rushed towards [Śiva] (*tāṉ ōṭa*), [and, Śiva sent] Murukaṉ (*kumaraṉ*) who killed [the demon] (*tuñcuvittu*). Tārakā's body [another demon] (*tārakaṉ uṭal*) was cut into pieces (*tuṇippittu*) by a woman (*oru peṇṇālē*). When he [Viṣṇu] was fearful (*añciṭa*), Puram was burnt down (*puram tīyūṭṭi*). He [Śiva] tore apart Jalandara's body

[512] When Viṣṇu was afraid of the demon Sūrapadman, he ran to Śiva and sought safety. Śiva sent Murukaṉ who killed the demon. See PIḶḶAI 1955:431.

[513] When Viṣṇu and other celestials sought Śiva's help in defeating the demon, Tārakāśura, Śiva sent Kāli, his consort, and she killed the demon. See PIḶḶAI 1955:431.

[514] When the fearful Viṣṇu sought Śiva's help in vanquishing the demons of Tirupuram, Śiva burnt down Tirupuram. See PIḶḶAI 1955:431.

(*calantaraṉ uṭal kīṇṭu*).[515] [Śiva] swallowed the poison (*nañciṉai uṇṭum*) [to save the world]. [These are the ways in which] Śiva (*nāyakaṉ*) protected the world (*aṉṟō ulakam kāttāṉ*).

VERSE 293

pārttaṉār iratam eṟip paṭaitaṉaip pārttuc cārpaik
kūrttaam pālē eytu koṉṟu ara cāḻēṉ eṉṉat
tērttaṉil iruntu māyai ceytumāl kollac ceppum
vārttainūl ākkik koṇṭāy puraṅkolnūl matittiṭāyē.

["Viṣṇu in his incarnation as Kṛṣṇa deceived Arjuna and persuaded him to kill his kinsmen. You accept such actions in your treatise. Will you also accept the atheistic teachings of the Buddha,[516] another incarnation of Viṣṇu?"].

TRANSLATION:

When Arjuna mounted the chariot (*pārttaṉār iratam eṟi*), he looked at the assembled army (*paṭaitaṉaip pārttu*) of his relatives (*cārpai*), refused to aim sharp arrows at them (*kūrtta ampālē eytu*) to kill them (*koṉṟu*) and became the king (*aracāḻēṉ eṉṉa*). Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*), seated at the chariot (*tērttaṉil iruntu*), deceived [Arjuna] (*māyai ceytu*) [with his devious] words to kill [his own people] (*kollac ceppum*), and you have accepted those words in your treatise (*vārttai nūl ākkik koṇṭāy*). Will you [also] accept the treatise composed at Tripura (*puraṅkol nūl matittiṭāyē*)?

VERSE 294

---

[515] When the demon Jalandaran chased Viṣṇu away from his abode of the Milky Ocean, Viṣṇu complained to Śiva who used Viṣṇu's discus to slay the demon. See PIḶḶAI 1955:431.

[516] Refers to a puranic account of how Viṣṇu incarnated as Buddha, preached atheism, authored a treatise, and persuaded the local people in Tripura to abandon their worship of Śiva. See PIḶḶAI 1955:429.

māyaitāṉ uyirkaḷ ākātu uyirkaḷtām māyai ākā
māyavaṉ ivaitāṉ ākāṉ ivaitāṉum māyaṉ ākā
ēyumām aṉāti yāka iṟaipacu pācam eṉṟē
tūyavaṉ kalappi ṉālē ellāmāyt tōṉṟu vaṅkāṇ.

["*Māyā* and souls are different in their natures, and one cannot become the other. Similarly, Viṣṇu cannot become either *māyā* or the souls, nor could they become Viṣṇu. The three categories of god, soul, and the bonds are eternal and the omnipresent Śiva appears as everything"].

TRANSLATION:

māyā [being inert] (*māyaitāṉ*) cannot become souls (*uyirkaḷ ākātu*) [and] the souls (*uyirkaḷtām*) cannot become *māyā* (*māyai ākā*). Viṣṇu (*māyavaṉ*) cannot become these [*māyā* and souls] (*ivaitāṉ ākāṉ*). These [*māyā* and souls] (*ivaitāṉum*) cannot become Viṣṇu (*māyaṉ ākā*). [The categories of] god (*iṟai*), soul (*pacu*), and bonds (*pācam*) are eternal (*aṉātiyāka ēyumām*). It is the omnipresent [Śiva] with his purity (*tūyavaṉ kalappiṉālē*) that appears as everything (*ellāmāyt tōṉṟuvaṅ kāṇ*).

VERSE 295

pācattaip pacukkaḷ viṭṭup patiyiṉai aṭaiya mutti
ācaṟṟa āka maṅkaḷ aṟaintiṭa aṟiviṉṟu iṅkē
mācaṟṟa mālmā cāki māyaiyum uṟuvaṉ eṉṉil
kūcippiṉ koḷḷār nallōr uṉakkāmik kuḻappu nūlē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin uses harsh language in rebuking the Pāñcarātrin. "The Āgamas declare that liberation is attained by the souls merging with Śiva when they get rid of their impurities. Your treatise, which states that Viṣṇu becomes *māyā* after assuming a soul, is confusing and disdainful"].

TRANSLATION:

The faultless Āgamas declare (*ācaṟṟa ākamaṅkaḷ aṟaintiṭa*) that when the souls renounce their attachments (*pācattaip pacukkaḷ viṭṭu*), they will attain salvation (*mutti*) and merge with Śiva (*patiyiṉai aṭaiya*). However, if you foolishly say that (*aṟiviṉṟu eṉṉil*) the pure Māl [Viṣṇu] (*mācaṟṟa māl*) becomes tainted (*mācāki*), [assumes a soul], and becomes *māyā* (*māyaiyum uṟuvaṉ*), wise people (*nallōr*) would disdain (*kūci*) and refuse (*piṉ koḷḷār*) your confusing treatise (*uṉakkām ik kuḻappu nūlē*).

VERSE 296

piramamnāṉ eṉṟa pōtu piramaṉōṭu ariyum kūṭi
paramaṉār ikali ṭāmal pārttuiṭar paṇṇi niṉṟa
uramaṉār aḻal urūpam taṉṉaiyum uṇara māṭṭāṉ
karammaṉ āḷ tikiri ēṟṟāṉ kaṭavuḷ eṉṟu aṟaivatu eṉṉē.

["Both Brahmā and Viṣṇu could not find the head and the feet of Śiva when Śiva stood as a fiery column, in order to quell their pride and challenged the two to find his head and feet.[517] How could Viṣṇu, who holds the discus in his hand and who could not realize the true nature of Śiva, be considered the real creator?"].

TRANSLATION:

When both Brahmā and Ari [Viṣṇu] (*piramaṉōṭu ariyum kūṭi*) claimed the role of Brahman as their own (*piramam nāṉ eṉṟa pōtu*), Śiva was troubled (*paramaṉār pārttu*) and wanted to settle the dispute without a fight (*iṭar paṇṇi niṉṟa ikaliṭāmal*). He appeared in his fiery form (*uramaṉār aḻal urūpam*), and they [Brahmā and Viṣṇu] could not find Śiva (*taṉṉaiyum uṇara māṭṭāṉ*) Do you [still]

[517] Śiva wanted to teach a lesson to both Viṣṇu and Brahmā and to settle the dispute. He appeared before them in his fiery form and told them that one of them should find his crown and the other should find his feet. Whoever succeeded will be acknowledged as the Brahman. Brahmā flew away on his mount, a species of swan and Viṣṇu took the form of a boar and began his quest to reach the feet. They did not succeed in their respective missions and Śiva clearly established his unquestionable supremacy. See MUTTAPPAN 2003:231.

want to call (*aṟaivatu eṉṉē*) the one with a discus in his hand (*karammaṉ āḷ tikiri ēṟṟāṉ*), the god (*kaṭavuḷ eṉṟu*)?

VERSE 297

tērari iṟaiyaṉṟu eṉṟē civamuṉi tatīci yōṭē
pōrpurintu ikala mālaip pukkavaṉ piṭittu aṭittu
mārpiṉil utaittu māltaṉ cakkaram vayiṟṟil vaittiṭṭu
ērmali paṭaipa ṭaittiṭṭu aripaṭa eṟintāṉ aṉṟē.

["When there was a dispute between Māl (Viṣṇu) and the Śaivite sage Tatīci, Viṣṇu was severely beaten up and his discus was buried in his stomach. Therefore, Viṣṇu is not the god, and Śiva, the one with the trident, is the true god"].

TRANSLATION:

Understand that Ari [Viṣṇu] is not god (*tēr ari iṟaiyaṉṟu eṉṟē*). When he fought (*pōr purintu*) with the Śaivite sage Tatīci (*civamuṉi tatīci yōṭē*), the hostile Māl [Viṣṇu] (*ikala māl*) was caught (*piṭittu*), was beaten up (*aṭittu*), and was kicked on his chest (*mārpiṉil utaittu*). Māl's [Viṣṇu's] discus (*māl taṉ cakkaram*) was buried in his stomach (*vayiṟṟil vaittiṭṭu*). The sage created an exquisite weapon (*ērmali paṭai paṭaittiṭṭu*) and threw the fainted Hari [Viṣṇu] down [with it] (*ari paṭa eṟintāṉ aṉṟē*).

VERSE 298

cūlikāṇ iṟai māl allaṉ cūliyait toḻumtur vācaṉ
māliṉār mārmi tippat tirumṟu mārpaṉ āki
nūliṉār mārpaṉ nōṉtāḷ paṭṭiṭam cuttam eṉṟu
pāliṉār kaṭalāṉ āṅkē parivoṭum tiruvai vaittāṉ.

[When the Śaivite sage Durvāsa stomped on Viṣṇu's chest, he left a scar that gave rise to the epithet Tirumaṟumārpaṉ (the one with the sacred scar on his

chest).[518] As Viṣṇu considered the scar sacred, he placed his consort on the scar].

TRANSLATION:

The one who carries the trident is the god [Śiva] (*cūlikāṇ iṟai*), and Māl [Viṣṇu] is not [the god] (*māl allaṉ*). The [sage] Durvāsa (*turvācaṉ*), who worships the trident (*cūliyait toḻum*), stomped on Māl's [Viṣṇu's] chest (*māliṉār mār mitippa*), thus making him Tirumaṟu Mārpaṉ (*tirumaṟu mārpaṉ ākiṉ*). [Viṣṇu] dwelling at the Milky Ocean (*pāliṉār kaṭalāṉ*) considered the scar on his chest (*mārpaṉ*) to be sacred (*cuttam eṉṟu*) as it was touched by a devotee (*nūliṉār nōṉtāḷ paṭṭiṭam*) and hence lovingly placed his consort there (*āṅkē parivoṭum tiruvai vaittāṉ*).

VERSE 299

tavakuṇa ṉāymāl ceṉṟu tīviyaic cakka rattāl
avakuṇam ceytuaṉṟu ōṭap pirukuvantu avaḷaip pārttuc
civaṉalatu aṟiyēṉ ākil ituceytōṉ ceṟika pattup
pavameṉa moḻiya mālum payappaṭṭup pataṟi vīḻntāṉ.

[When the Śaivite Sage Bṛhu discovered that his wife Tīvi had marks of violence on her body, she told him about the sexual advances made by Viṣṇu and because she refused, his attempts Viṣṇu had hurt her with his discus. Infuriated Bṛhu cursed Viṣṇu to have ten mortal births, and this curse made Viṣṇu falter and fall down in fear].

TRANSLATION:

Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*) made sexual advances towards Tīvi (*tavakuṇaṉāy ceṉṟu tīviyai*). [When she refused him], Viṣṇu disfigured her (*avakuṇam ceytu*) with his discus (*cakkarattāl*) and ran away (*ōṭa*). When the sage Bṛhu saw the condition

[518] When the sage Durvāsa stomped on Viṣṇu's chest, it created a scar and hence the name "Tirumaṟu mārpaṉ," which means "one with the sacred scar on his chest." See PIḶḶAI 1955:438.

of his wife (*piruku vantu avaḷaip pārttu*), he cursed (*eṉa moḻiya*) that if he were a true follower of Śiva (*civaṉ alatu aṟiyēṉ ākil*), whoever committed such an act (*itu ceytōṉ*) would undergo ten evil births (*ceṟika pattup pavam*). [On hearing this curse,] Māl [Viṣṇu] (*māl*) fell down in fear and distress (*payappaṭṭup pataṟi vīḻntāṉ*).

VERSE 300

payappaṭṭup paraṉai nōkkit tavampaṇṇap paraṇum tōṉṟi
nayattuañcal eṉṟu vēṇṭiṟṟu eṉṉeṉa nāra ṇaṇtāṉ
peyarttaruḷ piruku cāpam eṉa aṉpaṉ piruku eṉṉa
uyakkōḷnī pavamtōṟu eṉṉa ōmeṉṟāṉ ulaka nātaṉ.

[Viṣṇu performed austerities and begged Śiva to redeem him from Bṛhu's curse by annulling it. Śiva refused, saying that because Bṛhu was one of his staunch followers, he could not interfere. Then Viṣṇu persisted in performing austerities and requested Śiva to liberate him in each of the ten births. Śiva agreed to do so].

TRANSLATION:

[Viṣṇu] became fearful (*payappaṭṭu*) and performed penance (*tavam paṇṇa*) towards Śiva (*paraṉai nōkkit*). Śiva appeared (*paraṇum tōṉṟi*), comforted [Viṣṇu] telling him not to be fearful (*nayattu añcal eṉṟu*), [and asked him] what he wanted (*vēṇṭiṟṟu eṉṉeṉa*). Nāraṇaṉ [Viṣṇu] (*nāraṇaṉ*) wanted to be protected (*peyarttaruḷ*) from Bṛhu's curse (*tāṉ piruku cāpam*). Bṛhu being his devotee, Śiva [could not comply] (*eṉ aṉpaṉ piruku eṉṉa*). Then [Nāraṇaṉ] wanted to be redeemed in each of his [ten] births (*uyakkōḷnī pavam tōṟu eṉṉa*). The savior of the world [Śiva] agreed (*ōmeṉṟāṉ ulaka nātaṉ*).

VERSE 301

ippaṭip piruku cāpattu īraintu piṟappil vīḻntu
meyppaṭu tuyaram uṟṟu varupavaṉ vimalaṉ allaṉ

eppaṭi yāṉuñ coṉṉēṉ iṟaiari allaṉ eṉṟē
maippaṭi kaṇṭaṉ aṇṭaṉ malaraṭi vaṇaṅki ṭāyē.

[The Śaiva Siddhāntin in the final verse of the treatise concludes by saying that Viṣṇu is not without impurity, and is not the Supreme god. Hence, the Pāñcarātrin should adore and worship the feet of Śiva, the Lord of the Universe].

TRANSLATION:

Thus, due to Bṛhu's curse (*ippaṭip piruku cāpattu*), he [Viṣṇu] suffered (*vīḻntu*) in all his ten births (*īraintu piṟappil*), was subject to distress (*meyppaṭu tuyaram uṟṟu varupavaṉ*), and so cannot be [called the one] without impurity (*vimalaṉ allaṉ*). I have explained in many ways (*eppaṭi yāṉuñ coṉṉēṉ*) that Ari [Viṣṇu] is not the god (*iṟai ari allaṉ eṉṟē*). You should worship the adorable feet (*malaraṭi vaṇaṅki ṭāyē*) of the dark-throated Lord of the Universe [Śiva] (*maippaṭi kaṇṭaṉ aṇṭaṉ*).

TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF VERSES IN THE *PARAPAKKAM*

School	Verses	No. of Verses
Sautrāntika Buddhism	(64-134)	71
Lokāyata	(12-63)	52
Pāñcarātra	(264-301)	38
Māyāvāda (Advaita)	(220-252)	33
Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṁsā	(181-203)	23
Niganḍavāda (Jaina)	(143-164)	22
Ājīvika	(165-180)	16
Śabda Brahmavāda	(208-219)	12
Preliminaries	(1-11)	11
Bhāskara	(253-259)	7
Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā	(204-207)	4
Sāṁkhya	(260-263)	4
Yōgācāra Buddhism	(135-137)	3
Mādhyamika Buddhism	(138-140)	3
Vaibhāṣika Buddhism	(141-142)	2

APPENDIX 1 CIVAÑĀṆAPŌTAM BY MEYKAṆṬATĒVAR

It is worth noting the structure of the *Civañāṉapōtam*. To each aphorism (*sūtra*), Meykaṇṭatēvar appends a summary statement of its substance (*karutturai*) and then provides an interpretation of the aphorism followed by an explanation in a series of mini commentaries (*adhikaraṇam*). The commentary is styled as a thesis (*mēṟkōḷ*) supported by a reason (*ētu*) and one or two explicatory examples (*utāraṇam*). A literal translation of the verses without the commentaries and the examples would be too terse and disjointed to understand. For the sake of brevity, I have given a concise summary of each aphorism, taking into consideration Meykaṇṭatēvar's own comments on it. Thus, what follows is not a literal translation.

VERSE 1

avaṉ avaḷ atuveṉum avai mūviṉaimaiyiṉ
tōṟṟiya titiyē oṭuṅki malattu uḷatām
antam āti eṉmaṉār pulavar.

The world consists of objects as he, she, and it (male, female, and neuter genders). They undergo three operations (creation, maintenance, and dissolution) and there is an agent (for these activities).The reappearance after the dissolution is caused by the impurities. Those well versed in the scriptures say that end is the beginning (Śiva is the first cause).

VERSE 2

avaiyē tāṉē āy iru viṉaiyiṟ
pōkku varavu puriya āṇaiyiṉ
nīkkam iṉṟi niṟkum aṉṟē.

He is one with the souls. He is different from the souls. He is one and different from the souls. He is in inseparable union with *Śakti* (*Catti* in Tamil) and causes

the souls to experience the cycle of births and deaths, because of their twin acts (good and bad *karma*).

VERSE 3

uḷatuilatu eṉṟaliṉ eṉatuṭal eṉṟaliṉ
aimpulaṉ oṭukkam aṟitaliṉ kaṇpaṭiṉ
uṇṭiviṉai iṉmaiyiṉ uṇartta uṇartaliṉ
māyā iyantirat taṉuviṉuḷ āṉmā.

Rejecting every part of the body, saying it is my body, knowing (using) the five senses, knowing when they are suppressed (such as in sleep), existing in sleep without experiencing pain or pleasure, knowing from others, it is the soul in the body which is an instrument produced by *māyā*.

VERSE 4

antak karaṇam avaṟṟiṉoṉṟu aṉṟu avai
cantittatu āṉmāc cakaca malattu uṇarātu
amaiccuaracu ēyppaniṉṟu añca avattaittē.

The soul is not one of the inner instruments (*antaḥkaraṇa*).[519] It is not conscious (without knowledge) because of its intrinsic impurity. Just as a king rules with the help of his ministers, the mind functions with the help of the senses. It has five states.[520]

VERSE 5

---

[519] *Antaḥkaraṇa* (*antakkaraṇam* in Tamil) is the "inner instrument" representing the intellect (*buddhi*), mind (*manas*), ego (*ahaṃkāra*), and consciousness (*cit*). The equivalent terms in Tamil are *maṉam*, *putti*, *akaṅkāram*, and *cittam*, respectively.

[520] The soul has five states (*avasthā* in Sanskrit, and *avattai* in Tamil), waking (*jāgrat*), dreaming (*svapna*), dreamless sleep (*suṣupti*), "the fourth" (*turīya*), and "beyond the fourth" (*turīyātīta*). The equivalent terms in Tamil are *naṉavu*, *kaṉavu*, *tuyil*, *pēruṟakkam*, and *uyirp paṭakkam*, respectively.

viḷampiya uḷḷattu meyvāy kaṇmūkku
aḷantu aṟintu aṟiyā āṅkuavai pōlat
tāmtam uṇarviṉ tamiyaruḷ
kāntam kaṇṭa pacācattu avaiyē.

Although the body, mouth, eye, and nose can perceive objects[521] by the help of the soul, they cannot perceive either themselves or the soul; but they are perceived by the soul. Similarly, although the soul perceives objects (with the help of Śiva), it cannot perceive itself (or the presence of Śiva's force). The soul is guided by *Śakti* (*Catti* in Tamil), and is attracted to it just as iron is attracted by a magnet.

VERSE 6

uṇaruru acattu eṉiṉ uṇarātu iṉmaiyiṉ
irutiṟaṉ allatu civacattām eṉa
iraṇṭu vakaiyiṉ icaikkumaṉ ulakē.

If Śiva is knowable, he is *asat* (changeable). If he is unknowable, then he is non-existent. He is neither the one nor the other. Hence, the wise ones call him Śiva *Cit* (Śiva *sat*). He is Śiva or *Cit* when not understood by the souls, and *sat* when souls understand him with divine help.

VERSE 7

yāvaiyum cūṉiyam cattuetir ākaliṉ
cattē yaṟiyātu acattuilatu aṟiyā
irutiṟaṉ aṟivuḷatu iraṇṭalā āṉmā.

In the presence of *sat* everything else is non-existent (*cūṉiyam*). (Therefore), *sat* cannot perceive *asat*. As *asat* does not exist, it cannot perceive *sat*. (Hence), that

[521] For some obscure reason, Meykaṇṭatēvar does not include "ear."

which knows both is the soul, and it is neither *sat* nor *asat*.

VERSE 8

aimpula vēṭariṉ ayarntaṉai vaḷarntu eṉat
tammutal kuruvumāyt tavattiṉil uṇarttaviṭṭu
aṉṉiyam iṉmaiyiṉ araṉkaḷal celumē.

Because of the meritorious austerities (*tavam*), Śiva appears as the teacher (*kuru*) and instructs the soul that by associating itself with the savages, (*vēṭar*, literally a hunter), the five senses, it had lost knowledge of its true self. Understanding its real nature, the soul leaves them, and being not different from Śiva, the soul seeks Śiva's feet.

VERSE 9

ūṉakkaṇ pācam uṇarāp patiyai
ñāṉak kaṇṇiṉiṟ cintai nāṭi
urāttuṉait tērttu eṉap pācam oruvat
taṇ niḻalām pativiti eṇṇum añ ceḻuttē.

The soul knows the true nature of its own consciousness with the help of the spiritual vision (*ñāṉak kaṇ*) provided by Śiva, who cannot be perceived by imperfect knowledge and sense perception. By giving up worldly attachments, which are as false as a mirage (*taṇniḻal*), the soul will find Śiva. Let the soul contemplate on the five-lettered *mantra* (*añceḻuttu*).

VERSE 10

avaṉē tāṉē ākiya anneṟi
ēkaṉ āki iṟaipaṇi niṟka
malamāyai taṉṉoṭu valviṉai iṉṟē.

As Śiva becomes one with the soul in its human conditions, let the soul become

one with Śiva and realize that all actions are due to Śiva. Then the soul will lose its impurities of *malam*, *māyai*, and *karumam* (*malamāyai valviṉai*).

VERSE 11

kāṇum kaṇṇukkuk kāṭṭum uḷampōl
kāṇa uḷḷattaik kaṇṭu kāṭṭaliṉ
ayarā aṉpiṉ araṉkaḷal celumē.

Just as the soul enables the eyes to see, and itself sees, Śiva enables the soul to know, and itself knows. The soul remembers this with undying love and merges with Śiva's feet.

VERSE 12

cemmalar nōṉtāḷ cēral oṭṭā
ammalaṅ kaḷīi aṉparoṭu marīi
mālaṟa nēyam malintavar vēṭamum
ālayam tāmum araṉ eṉat toḷumē.

Having washed away the impurities that prevent the soul from reaching the lotus-like feet, and having associated with other realized souls who are constantly mindful of Śiva's love, the soul will get rid of its delusion and join those who abound in devotion to Śiva and visit his shrines.

APPENDIX 2 THE ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA CANON : MEYKAṆṬA CĀTTIRAṄKAḶ

1. *TIRUVUNTIYĀR*

The *Tiruvuntiyār* is the first book of the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*, the philosophical canon of Śaiva Siddhānta. An analysis of the *Tiruvuntiyār* is provided in section 1.3 of this thesis.

2. *TIRUKKAḶIṟṟUPPAṬIYĀR*

The *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* is the second book of the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ.* An analysis of the *Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār* is provided in section 1.3 of this thesis.

3. *CIVAÑĀṈAPŌTAM*

The *Civañāṉapōtam* is the third book of the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*, the philosophical canon of Śaiva Siddhānta. An analysis of the *Civañāṉapōtam* is provided in Appendix 1 of this thesis.

4. *CIVAÑĀṈA CITTIYĀR*

The *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* is the fourth book of the *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiraṅkaḷ*, the philosophical canon of Śaiva Siddhānta. An analysis of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* is provided in section 1.5 of this thesis.

5. *IRUPĀ IRUPATU*

Besides composing the *Parapakkam* and the *Cupakkam*, the two parts of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, Aruṇanti authored the *Irupā irupatu*, the fifth book of the

canon. It is written in alternating *veṇpā* and *āciriyappā* meters,[522] in *antāti* style. In twenty verses of the work, Aruṇanti expounds the basic tenets of Śaiva Siddhānta with clarity. He authored this treatise as a eulogy for his teacher, Meykaṇṭatēvar.

The *sūtra*s are in the form of questions and answers, and they address the basic principles of Śaiva Siddhānta, such as the entities of *pati*, *pacu*, and *pācam*, and the means for salvation. The author raises questions concerning the subtle theological and mystical issues, and answers them succinctly. Aruṇanti, with his intense love and admiration for his teacher Meykaṇṭatēvar, alludes to his teacher's greatness and pays him obeisance. To Aruṇanti, his teacher represents the first cause or Śiva.[523]

Some of the questions addressed are: Why do impurities affect souls when souls are protected by god. How do impurities cling to souls, and how are they removed? How does the soul attain realization, and what are the means required? What are the tools required for removing the impurities? What is the assurance that realized souls will not have any impurities?

In the introductory verse, Aruṇanti sets the stage for attaining absolute enlightenment through a dialogue with Meykaṇṭatēvar (*veṇṇey nallūr meykaṇṭāṉ*). Aruṇanti recognizes his teacher not as human, but as a personification of the three-eyed and blue-throated one [Śiva] (*kaṇṇutalum kaṇṭak kaṟaiyum karantu*), and one who absorbs all the impurities of the souls (*mākkaḷ mala*m *akaṟṟum*).[524]

To the question why, in spite of god's presence, the soul goes through its karmic experiences, Aruṇanti answers that in the presence of god's grace (*aruḷmuṉpu nillātu aṭiyēṟkuk kaṇṇiṉṟu*), the darkness [bondage] resulting from impurities is removed (*iruḷkoṇṭavāṟu eṉkol entāy*!) and the freed soul immediately

---

[522] *Veṇpā*, *Kalippā*, *Akaval* (*ācīriyappā*), and *Viruttam* are four kinds of meters in Tamil poetry. See DHAVAMONY 1971:245.

[523] *"…kuṟipārttu aruḷiṉam kurumutalāy eṉiṉ apakkuvam…" Irupā irupatu 2:19.*

[524] *Irupā irupatu 1:1-4.*

experiences freedom (*eṉṉuṭaiya mālaiyā māṟṟa mati*).[525] The karmic process is a requisite part of the soul's journey in its quest for a divine merger with Śiva.

He pleads with his teacher, "Since I assume both states of knowledge and ignorance (*aṟivu aṟiyāmai iraṇṭum aṭiyēṉ ceṟitalāl*), I am bewildered not knowing which of these I really am (*aṟivō aṟiyēṉō yātu eṉṟu*). Without deviating [from the issue], tell me your wise view (*āyntu kuṟimāṟu koḷḷāmal kūṟu*)."[526] "One without a beginning or end! Tell me, Why do I have these attachments (*pantam vantavāṟu iṅku antam āti illāy aruḷē*?)."[527]

Then, the real interrogation begins with Aruṇanti recalling what Meykaṇṭatēvar had explained, probably orally to him and the other students, in relation to the behavioral dispositions of the human beings. One may note here that the questions appear to be essentially psychological; a psychology that is meant here as an analytical understanding of human behavior. He recalls his teacher's words about the seven traits or behavioral dispositions that are attributed to *māyai*, the delusion producer.

The soul suffers from a misconception that it is the sole agent, and it alone is responsible for all the events because of its own power. The concept of "mineness" becomes predominant (*eṉṉaiyum taṉṉaiyum aṟiviṉṟu iyaṟṟi eṉṉatu yāṉ eṉum akantai yum kaṇṭu*), and the soul forgets its origin and exhibits the lack of gratitude.[528] However, due to his immense love for the souls (*aruḷmika uṭaimaiyil aruḷtuṟai vantu*), which demonstrate devotion (*bhakti*), god shines his grace in the ego of the souls (*taṉṉatum tāṉumāy eṉṉai iṉṟākkit*) and bestows the gift of himself on the souls (*taṉṉaiyum eṉṉaiyum tantu taṉatu*).[529] In this treatise, Aruṇanti elaborates on the divine immanence–how, when the soul eventually realizes its total dependence on god and with loving devotion surrenders to him, it merges with and stands united with god forever.

---

[525] *Irupā irupatu 5:1-4.*
[526] *Irupā irupatu 3:1-4.*
[527] *Irupā irupatu 4:28-29.*
[528] *Irupā irupatu 18:6-7.*
[529] *Irupā irupatu 18:19-20.*

6. *UṆMAI VIḶAKKAM*

The *Uṇmai Viḷakkam* is the sixth book of the canon, and it was composed by Maṇavācakam Kaṭantār.[530] He was of the Brahmin caste and a native of Tiruvaṭikai. He wrote the treatise in the form of a dialogue between Kaṭantār and his teacher Meykaṇṭatēvar. The title specifies that it is an explanation (*viḷakkam*) of the Truth (*uṇmai*). Not much is known about Maṇavācakam Kaṭantār, besides being one of the forty-nine students of Meykaṇṭatēvar and his authoring of the *Uṇmai viḷakkam*.

In fifty-four *sūtra*s, the author sheds light on the concept of categories (*tattva*s) and expounds on the details of the thirty-six categories accepted in Śaiva Siddhānta. The work also expounds on the nature of impurities, *karma*, the self, and the five-lettered sacred *mantra*.[531] Repeatedly, the author stresses the importance and unquestionable authority of the Āgamas.[532] He also takes pains to emphasize the significance of the five-lettered mystic word (*na-ma-ci-vā-ya*) in eight *sūtra*s (39-47), and the benefits it will provide for the practicing aspirant. If one meditates upon this important word (*eḻuttu aintum eṇṇil*), the soul will get rid of its impurities (*iruḷāṉatu tīra*) and land the soul in pure joy (*iṉpattē*), in the sacred place where there is neither light nor darkness (*irāppakal aṟṟu*), and the soul will be united with god because of his grace (*aruḷāṉatu civattē ākkum*).[533]

---

[530] Pillai speculates that the author of the *Uṇmai Viḷakkam* must have been a sage of advanced years, evident from the name he bears (Maṇavācakam Kaṭantār), which means 'he who has passed beyond thought and speech.' See PILLAI 1984:5.

[531] "O, my Teacher, explain to me (*tēcikaṉē! cāṟṟu*)! What are the thirty-six categories (*āṟāṟu tattuvam ētu*)? What is impurity (*āṇavam ētu*)? What is that karma [which exists in my life] (*māṟā viṉai ētu*)? Who am I who seem to differ from these…? (*maṟṟuivaṟṟiṉ vēṟu ākā nāṉ ētu*)? Who are you (*nī ētu*)? What is the sacred dance of the Lord (*nātaṉ naṭam ētu*)? What is the truth behind the five-lettered word (*añceḻuttuttāṉ ētu*)?" *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 5.*

[532] I am now imparting [this] to you in accordance with the teachings of the supreme Āgamas (*teḷḷiyacīr ākamaṅkaḷ coṉṉa aṭaivilē*) *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 4*. Therefore, the Āgamas declare (*ākamaṅkaḷ ōtum*). *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 7.* As stated by the ancient Āgamas… (*āti aruḷnūl aṟaiyum*…). *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 18*. Therefore, the good Āgamas declare (*nal ākamam ōtum*). *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 30*, *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 46*.

[533] *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 43.*

The author uses the word darkness to denote impurities (*malam*) in general, which are of three kinds (*māyai*, *viṉai* or *kaṉmam*, and *āṇavam*). He notes that the Āgamas proclaim (*aṅkivitta ākamam*) that such a union with god (*muttitaṉai aṭaintōr*) is similar to (*pōla*) a fruit and its juice (*paḻam iratam*), a flower and its fragrance (*pōtu maṇam*), fire and its heat (*aṅki vemmai*), [or, a musical composition with] a Veena and its tune (*vīṇai eḻil nātam*).[534]

The *Uṇmai viḷakkam* highlights the importance of the merciful and benevolent nature of god. Śiva (*tiruampalattāṉ*) is the embodiment of grace and compassion (*aruḷ mūrttiyāk koṇṭa*), and mercy is his very nature (*karuṇai uruk koṇṭu*).[535]

His lineage (Meykaṇṭatēvar, Aruṇanti Civācāriyār, Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar, and Umāpati Civācāriyār) is also documented by Umāpati when he pays tribute to the originator of the lineage. [536]

7. *CIVAPPIRAKĀCAM*

The seventh treatise of the canon is the *Civappirakācam*; it is considered the most important treatise written by Umāpati, who also authored seven other treatises of the canon. He was the disciple of Maṟaiñāna Campantar. According to tradition, Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar was a student of Aruṇanti and did not write any treatises; he taught the basic tenets of the Śaiva Siddhānta to his Brahmin student Umāpati Civācāriyār, who eventually wrote several treatises, both in Sanskrit and Tamil.[537] Born in a Brahmin family, Umāpati is said to be a convert from Vaiṣṇavism. The date of his death is preserved in monastic tradition as 1325 CE.[538]

---

[534] *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 46*.

[535] *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 38.*

[536] You [Meykaṇṭatēvar] pointed out the false nature [of the world] and you removed it [falsehood]. You, who reside in Tiruveṇṇai Nallūr, will reveal the truth to us and will not show us the false [path]. You exalted one; please grace us with your answers to my questions. *Uṇmai Viḷakkam 39.*

[537] See IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988:xii.

[538] See ZVELEBIL 1995:720-721.

Unlike his other canonical works, Umāpati begins this work of one-hundred verses with twelve invocatory verses and the language used in this treatise, while exquisite, is still easy to understand compared to some of his other contributions.[539]

The *Civappirakācam* is considered a secondary text (*cārpunūl*) for the *Civañāṉapōtam.* The treatise in its prologue (*pāyirappakuti*) sheds light on the Śaiva lineage of teachers, the nature of Śaiva literature, and the details of the initiation process (*tīkkai vakai*). The fifty *sūtra*s, in the first part of the general section, have explanatory notes on the first two *sūtra*s of the *Civañāṉapōtam*. The second part, containing the other fifty *sūtra*s, deals with the rest of the twelve *sūtra*s of the *Civañāṉapōtam* and provides analysis of the three states of *avattai*.[540] How the souls receive the knowledge from the god, how the souls endure the karmic process, how Śiva reaches out to the souls in the form of a teacher, and the optimum conditions for the souls to receive salvation are some of the other issues discussed in this treatise.

Umāpati was conscious that he was adding some new points of view to established Śaiva doctrines. In his preface to the *Civappirakācam*, he declares that whatever is old cannot be declared good purely based on its antiquity (*toṉmaiyavām eṉum evaiyum naṉṟu ākā*), and whatever treatise appears today cannot be judged as poor just because of its novelty or "newness" (*iṉṟu tōṉṟiya nūl eṉum evaiyum tītu ākā*).[541] Just as a ruby is not rejected because it is wrapped in a dirty rag (*naṉmaiyiṉār nalaṅkoḷ maṇi potiyum ataṉ kaḷaṅkam navai*

---

[539] Though dated and archaic in style, Hoisington's translation has fidelity to the original text, and his notes are exhaustive. See HOISINGTON 1854.

[540] In emerging from its impure to its pure state, the soul experiences metamorphosis, and the different states experienced in transition are called *avattai*s. In its initial state of *kēvala avattai*, the soul stays in a dormant and desolate state covered by impurities (*āṇavam*), while *karumam* dominates. In the next state of *cakala avattai*, the soul takes on a body, enters the phenomenal world where it interacts with matter manifested by *māyai*. In its next state of *cutta avattai,* the soul is emancipated and becomes a *cīvaṉmuttaṉ*. In this state, the soul, though emancipated, continues to live in the phenomenal world. Eventually, when the soul sheds its physical body, becomes a *paramuttan*, and merges with Śiva, it enjoys the bliss of the union.

[541] *Civappirakācam 12:1-2*.

ākātu), his treatise should not be rejected without strict scrutiny, even if some may not agree with his views.[542]

Just as he did in the *Viṉā Veṇpā*, Umāpati repeats the same theme and declares his disdain, almost contempt, towards the less educated of the potential readers of his treatise. He cleverly categorizes his readers by stating that the truly learned will receive the truths stated in his work without paying attention to its novelty or its defects in language.[543] The average scholar will receive his work well, if it echoes the excellent views expressed in the ancient texts (*naṭuvām taṉmaiyiṉār paḷamai aḷaku ārāyntu tarippar*); unlike the learned ones, the average scholar will not evaluate the work on its intrinsic merits. The unlearned ones, who will never understand the real merits of a work, will praise the work when they are in the company of those who appreciate the work (*iṉmaiyiṉār palarpukaḷil ēttuvar ētilar uṟṟu)* and criticize the work when they are in the company of those who have a poor opinion of the work (*ikaḷntiṉarēl ikaḷntiṭuvar*). They do not have any opinion of their own (*tamakku eṉa oṉṟu ilarē*).

In the penultimate *sūtra* of the treatise, Umāpati provides a self-appraisal of his work. He states, "With the help of grace, I have explained here the nature of both bondage and emancipation (*petta muttikaḷ malaivu aṟum uṇarvāl*), which are the focal points of Vedic studies (*vēta*). The meaning of such a study is most profitable (*talai taru poruḷāy*) and the nature of the study provides happiness (*iṉpattāy*). The subjects I speak of transcend the knowledge of all the schools from the Materialists (*ulakāyata āti nikaḷ*) to the Śivādvaitins (*civāttuvita antattukku*).[544]

8. *TIRUVARUṬPAYAṈ*

Umāpati Civācāriyār composed the eighth book of the canon, the *Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ.*

---

[542] *Civappirakācam 12.*

[543] He learned Tamil in his adult life and exhibits his mastery of the language in all his contributions to the canon.

[544] *Civappirakācam 99.*

It was written in a style very similar to that of Tiruvaḷḷuvar's *Tirukkuṟaḷ*. It appears that Umāpati wanted to complete the *Tirukkuṟaḷ*, which dealt with only the first three major aims or goals of human in life, namely *aṟam*, *poruḷ*, and *iṉpam* and left out *vīṭu*.[545] In his work, Umāpati focuses on the aspect of the emancipation of the soul. He exclusively deals with the concept of grace and explains the Śaiva Siddhānta theology in a very easy-to-understand language.

The name of the treatise—the *Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ*—means the "Fruits (*payaṉ*) of divine (*tiru*) grace (*aruḷ*)." This remarkable lucidly written treatise consists of ten chapters of ten couplets each. The contents deal with all the categories of Śaiva Siddhānta, with particular emphasis on the experience of grace. The chapters are titled: (1) The nature of the supreme, (2) the nature of the soul, (3) the nature of the fetters or darkness (4) the nature of divine grace, (5) the nature of the divine teacher, (6) the light on the path, (7) the enlightenment of the soul (8) the nature of the supreme bliss, (9) the grace through the mystic formula of the "five letters", and (10) the nature of the liberated.[546]

The first five chapters deal with the divine grace, and the last five with the fruits thereof. Umāpati has managed to express his convictions in both religion and philosophy. He expounds how, by the grace of god, the soul attains the ultimate stage of love of Śiva. Grace in different forms and its influence on the soul are matters of deep philosophic interest and Umāpati deals with them in a profound way. He also advocates the importance of the sacred "five-letters" with particular stress on the manner of pronouncing them according to the level of maturity of the souls.[547] In chapters four and five, Umāpati elaborates on the nature and forms of divine grace. It is worth mentioning that Umāpati uses powerful metaphors to convey his message. He also displays his mastery of the Tamil language and his poetic skills. A sampling of his similes and metaphors follow.

---

[545] In Sanskrit, the four stages of the *Puruṣārtha*s are *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa.*
[546] See PILLAI 1945.
[547] See GHOSE 1984:120.

When the souls are covered with impurities, the souls and their bodies will not see the truth unless Śiva's grace illuminates them.[548] Similar to the fish in the milky ocean, the souls, instead of enjoying the surrounding heavenly joy, wallow in their misery.[549] To the eyes of the owl, light itself is dense darkness; such is the case with the souls, which do not see god.[550] [The impurities of the soul are] similar to the woman who makes love to many people, yet hides her true nature from her husband.[551] The fate of the souls in fetters is similar to that of a man who, even when he is in water up to the neck, feels thirsty or similar to the man who is not able to see even after daybreak.[552] [While stressing the important and necessary role of a teacher] he says: If the crystal can reflect light without the help of the sun, then knowledge can be acquired without the help of a teacher.[553] To make a point that the soul under the influence of impurities cannot appreciate grace, he says that even sweet milk will taste bitter to a tongue affected by jaundice; after cleansing, proper taste will be regained.[554] Those who have realized the ultimate truth ignore the means by which they attained the goal, just as a person falling asleep unconsciously drops the object that he has been holding in his hand.[555] Just as the tortoise withdraws its head and organs into itself when threatened, the realized soul when experiencing any external sense

---

[548] *ūṉ aṟiyā toṉṟum uyir aṟiyā toṉṟum ivai tāṉ aṟiyā tār aṟivār tāṉ. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 4:3.*
[549] *pāl āḻi mīṉ āḻum pāṉmait taruḷ uyirkaḷ māl āḻi āḻum maṟittu. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 4:4.*
[550] *ū maṉ kaṇ pōla oḻiyum mika iruḷē yāmmaṉ kāṇā tavai. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 2:9.*
[551] *plaraip puṇarntum pāvaikku uṇṭeṉṟum kaṇavarkkut tōṉṟāta kaṟpu. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 3:4.*
[552] *veḷḷattuḷ nāvaṟṟi eṅkum viṭintiruḷām kaḷḷat talaivar kaṭaṉ. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 4:8.*
[553] *ñāṉam ivaṉ oḻiya naṇṇiṭum naṟkal aṉal pāṉu oḻiyap paṭiṉ. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 5:10.*
[554] *tittikkum pāltāṉum kaikkum tiruntiṭunāp pittattil tāṉ tavirnta piṉ. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 7:2.*
[555] *oṇporuṭkaṇ uṟṟārkku uṟupayaṉē allātu kaṇpaṭuppōr kaipporuḷpōl kāṇ. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 8:8.*

stimuli, will withdraw itself from the senses and enter into Śiva.[556]

It is worth noting that Śaivism has a strong theistic position with a powerful devotional cult associated with it, which translates to "love of god." The *Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ* undoubtedly resonates with the underlying sentiments of the faith.

9. *VIṈĀ VEṆPĀ*

Umāpati Civācāriyār is the author of the *Viṉā Veṇpā*, the ninth book of the canon. As the name suggests, in thirteen *sūtra*s written in *veṇpā* meter, the author poses questions dealing with intricate doctrinal issues to his teacher, Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar.[557] The answers provide clarifications on some of the difficulties an aspirant could experience in his spiritual quest. Just as does Aruṇanti's *Irupā irupatu*, this treatise also raises doubts about some complex theological issues and provides answers for them. In every *sūtra*, the author uses his teacher's name as a refrain.

From the references made by the author, it appears as though he wrote the *Viṉā Veṇpā* to help those who had already studied the three basic treatises of the Śaiva Siddhānta system, namely the *Civañāṉapōtam*, the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār*, and the *Civappirakācam*. The significant contribution of the treatise is to explain how the Śaiva Siddhānta system reconciles the various difficulties in philosophical investigation.[558]

A glaring contrast in Umāpati's persona can be discerned. In the first *sūtra*, he takes the humble path and considers himself a lowly sinner. He asks how Śiva could appear (*niṉṟavāṟu evvāṟu nī*) before a sinner (*koṭuviṉaiyēṉ*) resembling

---

[556] *pulaṉ aṭakkit tammutalkaṇ pukuṟuvār pōtār talamnaṭakkum āmai taka. Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ 10:4.*

[557] Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar, along with Meykaṇṭatēvar, Aruṇanti, and Umāpati, is one of the four Śaiva Ācāryas who promulgated the Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy. They are collectively called Cantāṉakuravar, suggesting that they trace their succession from Śiva. See *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "cantāṉa kuravar" (p. 1265-1266)*..

[558] See GANGADARAN 1992:10.

him, which is as incompatible as the coexistence of both light and darkness (*nīṭum oḷiyum niṟai iruḷum ōr iṭattukkuk kūṭal aritu*).[559] His humility is palpable. However, in his concluding *sūtra*, Umāpati stresses the importance of his work in explaining the essential doctrinal issues of Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, with a certain sense of self-aggrandizement. He states that his explanations are so clearly stated that if one does not understand the *Viṉā Veṇpā* (*viṉāveṇpā uṇmai viṉāvārēl*), it will be akin to a person who is dumb (not having the faculty of speech), and hence cannot explain the contents of his dream (*ūmaṉ kaṉāviṉ pāl eytuvikkum kāṇ*).[560] His analogy emphasizes that he is very explicit and lucid in his analysis, and therefore is beyond any possible criticism or reproach. He affirms that his treatise facilitates clear understanding of the basic tenets.

One interesting claim by Umāpati in this short treatise is about the state of the soul while in bondage, and its state during emancipation. He claims that in both cases, if the three factors—the soul or the perceiver, the object perceived or Śiva, and the process of perception—are not united, then there is no experience (*kāṇpāṉum kāṭṭuvatum kāṇpatuvam nīttu*). Only those who transcend beyond such experiences will achieve salvation (*uṇmai kāṇpārkaḷ naṉmutti kāṇārkaḷ*).[561]

10. *PŌṟṟIP PAKṟOṬAI*

The *Pōṟṟip Paḵṟoṭai* is the tenth book of the canon, also written by Umāpati Civācāriyār. it is a collection of hymns of praise (*tōttiram, stotra* in Sanskrit) to god that could also be considered as a doctrinal treatise (*cāttiram*, *śāstra* in Sanskrit). It portrays Śiva as one with limitless love for his followers and one who shows an uncompromising and unfailing benevolence. The author relates to his own spiritual experience in conveying his ideas. In ninety-five *sūtra*s, Umāpati deals with fourteen specific issues.

---

[559] *Viṉā Veṇpā 1.*
[560] *Viṉā Veṇpā 13.*
[561] *Viṉā Veṇpā 11.*

In this treatise, Umāpati praises the benevolent nature of Śiva whose concern for the souls is paramount. The entire work rings with the praise for and glory of Śiva. As a general breakdown of the treatise, Umāpati describes the nature of god (1,4),[562] his capacity to carry out his manifestations, (5), the nature and elimination of fetters (6-10), how the impurities are eliminated and the involvement of *Māyai* (11-14), the nature of the souls from conception to release and the suffering involved in between (15-40), the karmic process (41-54), the nature of life after release (55-59), god's grace bestowed on three kinds of souls (60-71), worshipping Śiva through four stages to acquire the ultimate Śiva knowledge (72-88), condemnation of *aham brahmāsmi* (89),[563] and the greatness of god-realization in Śaiva Siddhānta (90-94).

Many schools of Indian philosophy entertain a common concept of god's *līlai*, that is, how god creates the phenomenal world just as a play or sport. On the contrary, in Śaiva Siddhānta, it is clearly stated that there is a purpose behind god's creation (*paṭaittum*) of several forms of life (*vevvēṟu kuṉṟāta pal uyir*), their sustenance (*avai kāttum*), and eventual absorption (*iḷappu oḻiya iṭṭu vaittum*).[564] Umāpati describes the pervading nature of the impurities, and how they cling to the souls similar to how husk clings to paddy (*muntu uṟṟa nellukku umita viṭu*), or resembling the patina on copper (*nīṭu cempil kāḷitamum*).[565] The impurities (*āṇavattāl*) cover the eyes of the [soul's] intelligence (*ñāṉattiṉ kaṇṇai maṟaitta*), similar to a snake hiding the jewel in its mouth (*māmaṇiyai uḷ aṭakkum mānākam...pōl*).[566]

All souls go through the maturing process but at different paces, and god bestows upon each of them a different grace.[567] When the soul reaches the last

---

[562] Numbers in brackets are the verse numbers in the *Pōṟṟip Paḵroṭai*.

[563] "*aham brahmasmi*" (I am Brahman) is one of the *mahāvākyas* (great sayings) of Upaniṣadic thought.

[564] *Pōṟṟip Paḵroṭai 5.*

[565] *Pōṟṟip Paḵroṭai 7.*

[566] *Pōṟṟip Paḵroṭai 9.*

[567] Śaiva Siddhānta classifies souls according to the influence of impurities (*mala*) into *viñāṉakalar*, *piraḷayākalar*, and *cakalar*. *Viñāṉakalar*s are those souls that have successfully

state of its maturity, the *viñāṉakalar* stage (*muttitaru naṉṉeṟi viñāṉakalar nāṭu*), god unites with the soul and destroys its impurities (*āṇavamalam*) and bestows the soul (*malam oṉṟaiyum...aṟuttu aruḷi*) with Śiva knowledge.[568] The gift [knowledge] thus bestowed (*pērāḷaṉ tanta poruḷ ētu eṉṉil*) would allow the soul to stay in a close union (*vantu puṇarā vaḻakku ākki*) displaying a unity in duality (*tāṉ vēṟu nāṉ vēṟāy*).[569]

Umāpati cautions that one should be aware of the difference between the non-dual relationship in the Śaiva Siddhānta and the Advaitic non-dual relationship. In Advaita, the self or *ātman* is identical to Brahman, whereas in Śaiva Siddhānta, the union between the soul and Śiva represents a relationship of duality in unity. There is a strong refutation of the Advaitins (*akampiramak kārar*) and rejection of their identity-equation position as false and myopic talk (*avikāram pēcum*).

Umāpati concludes the treatise with homage to his teacher, Maṟaiñāṉa Campantar. "I extoll the greatness of my teacher (*campanta māmuṉi*), who entered my inner life (*uḷ niṉṟa*) with his golden key [of benevolence] (*poṉ tāḷ*) to enrich my barren life (*vempanta vāḻkkai?*).[570]

11. *KOṬIKKAVI*

The eleventh book of the canon is written by Umāpati Civācāriyār, and it is the *Koṭikkavi,* a short work of four *sūtra*s. During festival times, it is customary to commence the temple celebrations with the hoisting of the temple banner. Legend has it that during the time of Umāpati Civācāriyār's stay close to Citamparam, when the Brahmin priests could not hoist the banner at the temple

---

overcome the influence of one impurity, namely, the *āṇavamalam*. *Piraḷayākalar*s are those souls that have overcome the effect of one impurity, namely, the *māyāmalam*, but are still under the influence of *kaṉmamalam* and *āṇavamalam*. The third class of souls that are under the influence of all three impurities—*āṇavamalam*, *māyāmalam*, and *kaṉmamalam*—are called *cakalar*s. See NANDIMATH 2001:265, 269, and 274.

[568] *Pōṟṟip Paṟkroṭai 60.*

[569] *Pōṟṟip Paṟkroṭai 83.*

[570] Concluding verse in *Pōṟṟip Paṟkroṭai*.

festival, they heard a divine voice saying, “If Umāpati visits, the banner could be hoisted.”[571] Then the priests approached Umāpati Civācāriyār, and he immediately went to Citamparam and sang the first *sūtra*.[572] Miraculously, the banner was hoisted on its own. Then Umāpati sang the other three *sūtra*s, which suggest that just as the banner ascends, the individual soul ascends to the feet of Śiva. The temple banner symbolizes the commencement of something important. It implies the making up of one’s mind to turn to spirituality and persevere steadfastly until the end.

The underlying message of this minor work appears to be an affirmation that there is a strong link between the austerities of temple worship as specified in the Āgamas and the basic principles of Śaiva Siddhānta. In the fourth *sūtra*, the author highlights the significance of the five-lettered mystic word. He cautions that the mere repetition of the sacred syllables by the aspirant will not bear any fruit, and the words have to resonate with deep inner realization and sincerity from the heart (*neñcu a̲luttip pēcum*).

12. *NEÑCUVIṬU TŪTU*

The *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu* is the twelfth book of the canon, again written by Umāpati Civācāriyār. The title literally means “The Message (*tūtu*) Sent by the Heart (*neñcuviṭu*),” and it explores the love of god. The hundred and twenty-nine *sūtra*s of this treatise written in *kaliveṇpā* style are a homage paid by Umāpati to his teacher, Ma̲raiñāṉa Campantar; it is in the form of a “personified” heart that sends a message to its beloved. The author elaborates on how Śiva manifested himself in the form of his own teacher, and how Śiva further granted him his

---

[571] “*Umāpati vantāl koṭi ēṟum*.” See IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988:232.

[572] "Both light and darkness reside in oneself (*oḷikkum iruḷukkum oṉṟē iṭam*). When one dominates, the other declines (*oṉṟu mēl iṭil oṉṟuoḷikkum*); but light can never be completely obscured (*eṉiṉum iruḷ aṭarātu*). Knowledge (*telikkum a̲rivu*), which is the "life of very life" (*uḷ uyirkku uyirāy)*, shines through a little but is bathed [obscured] by the three types of impurities (*tirimalattē kuḷikkum*). To facilitate the soul to attain grace (*uyir aruḷ kūṭum*), I hoist the flag (*paṭikoṭi kaṭṭiṉaṉē*)." *Koṭikkavi 1*.

grace in order to possess the author's persona. Umāpati also alludes to different paths of devotion whereby a follower could realize his union with Śiva. In displaying his utter devotion to Śiva, Umāpati explains the symbolism of the lordship and grace by means of the ten insignia (*tacāṅkam*).[573]

In this treatise, Umāpati deals with Śiva's grace and his limitless compassion towards the souls. He affirms that Śiva's grace is the only power that can regulate all events of the world, which are all manifestations geared towards the succor of the souls. In explaining the role of Śiva as a lover, he expands on the theme of the role of a king with ten regal insignia.[574]

In the *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu*, Umāpati reiterates his constant teaching that only devotion (*bhakti*) to Śiva will enable the soul to attain *mutti*.[575] Examples of his devotion are streaming tears of love (*nāṭṭattāl teḷnīr aruviviḻa*)[576] and melting of the heart (*uḷakampam koṇṭu uḷ uruki*);[577] he also describes how Śiva enters the inner being of the soul (*ūṉāki evvuyirkkum uḷ pukuntu*),[578] and how he bestows release and accepts the soul as part of himself (*tāṉāya vīṭu aḷittut taṉṉil pirivu illā*).[579] Those aspirants who constantly contemplate on Śiva are blessed with special revelations (*niṉṟāṉ aṉaittum niṟaintāṉ niṉaippavarpāl ceṉṟāṉ teriyat*

---

[573] IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988:xiv.

[574] Umāpati characterizes the ten insignias of Śiva as follows: 1. Righteousness is his mountain (*kulavi viḷaṅku kuṇak kuṉṟōṉ*); 2. Bliss is his river from the mountain of righteousness (*āṉantam eṉpatōr āṟu uṭaiyāṉ*); 3. The land which cannot be reached by the Āgamas is his country (*ākamaṅkaḷ pārttu uṇarntu naṇṇa ariyatoru nāṭu uṭaiyāṉ*); 4. Repository of knowledge of Śiva is his city (*civañāṉa mōṉattāl ōṭṭu aṟṟu vīṟṟu irukkōm ūr uṭaiyāṉ*); 5. Grace is his garland (*aruḷ mēlāy viḷaṅku alaṅkal meyyiṇāṉ*); 6. He owns the horse that accounts for all human souls and their thoughts (*ellāmāy allavāy eṇṇuvār eṇṇattuḷ nillāmal niṟkum nīḷ vāciyāṉ*); 7. Divine wisdom is his elephant (*maruvit tikaḻ ñāṉa āṉaiyāṉ*); 8. His banner removes all pain and misery (*cumai tuṇpam nīkkum tuvacaṉ*); 9. The eternal sound, which enables the souls to forget their miseries and enjoy the divine light, is his drum (*tammai maṟantu taḻal oḷiyuḷḷē...niṉṟu muḻaṅkum neṭumuracōṉ*); 10. His reign extends beyond the world of Brahma and Viṣṇu (*mālum ayaṉum vakuttu aḷitta vaiyam ellām...appālum eppālum...eḻil āṇaiyāṉ*).

[575] See DHAVAMONY 1971:314.

[576] *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu 61.*

[577] *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu 62.*

[578] *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu 55.*

[579] *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu 56.*

teriyātaṉ).[580] Appearing in the form of a spiritual preceptor (*kuru*), Śiva lights the lamp of grace, making the aspirants realize the immensity of Śiva's love and makes them realize their inner spirit (*niṉṟa peruviḷakkiṉ pēroḷiyāy uḷḷē piracam maruvum malarpōl matittu aṅku*);[581] then, the souls enter into a union with Śiva in perfect love (*meyñāṉam ākki maṉam ellām iṟappittāṉ eṉ piṟavi īrttāṉ)*.[582]

13. *UṆMAI NEṚI VIḶAKKAM*

The thirteenth book of the canon, the *Uṇmai Neṟi Viḷakkam*, has been attributed to Umāpati Civācāriyār. The title literally means "The Exposition of the True Path." There are some disagreements among scholars concerning the authorship of this treatise, and it is beyond the scope of my thesis to delve into the controversies. In six *sūtra*s, the author deals with ten kinds of spiritual experiences available to the aspirant.[583] Collectively, these ten spiritual experiences are referred to as *taca-kāriyam*, meaning "the ten spiritual experiences of the soul in its path towards final deliverance."[584]

Progressing through these stages, the aspirants discard their ignorance and gain knowledge (*pāy iruḷ nīṅki ñāṉam taṉaik kāṇṭal*); thus, they free themselves from the selfish experience of "I" and "mine" and become the enjoyers of divine grace as spelled out in the Āgamas (*āṉma cutti aruḷ nūlil vitittavāṟē*).[585]

These ten experiences help the aspirant in realizing the true nature of the three basic realities in Śaiva thought, namely god, self, and the impurities or bondages. Such a realization will facilitate the soul to achieve union with god and become conscious of the merger (*uyiruḷ kāṇṭal civarūpam ākum*).[586]

---

[580] *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu 35.*
[581] *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu 96.*
[582] *Neñcuviṭu Tūtu 99.*
[583] "*tattuva rūpam, tattuva taricaṉam, tattuva cutti, āṉma rūpam, āṉma taricaṉam, āṉma cutti, civarūpam, civataricaṉam, civayōkam*, and *civapōkam*." See IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988:xiv.
[584] *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "taca-kāriyam" (p. 1712)*.
[585] *Uṇmai Neṟi Viḷakkam 2.*
[586] *Uṇmai Neṟi Viḷakkam 3.*

The author sums up his view by explaining how both knowledge and devotion are essential for the soul to arrive at self-realization and emancipation.

14. *CAṄKAṟPA NIRĀKARAṆAM*

The *Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam* is the last of the fourteen treatises of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta canon written by Umāpati. Along with the *Civappirakācam* the *Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam* is important, for both its style and contents. As already mentioned, the date of the latter work is mentioned in the text itself as *Saka* 1235, which corresponds to 1313 CE. Goodall points out that it is the only authentic reference available in establishing the dates of all the other treatises of the canon.[587]

As for the title of the treatise, in its context of the canon, the word "*caṅkaṟpam*" means a doctrine,[588] and the word "*nirākaraṇam*" means refutation or repudiation.[589] In his attempt to establish the true means to emancipation based on Śaiva Siddhānta principles, Umāpati takes on many of the sub-schools of Śaiva thought and systematically dismantles their doctrines. In this treatise, Umāpati disparages nine schools of Śaiva thought, which include *māyāvāda* or Śaṅkarācārya's Advaita.[590] The author has positioned himself in a neutral territory between his position and the position of other schools, examined the doctrines of both sides, and after being convinced about the superiority of his position, has documented his views.[591] The treatise consists of twenty sections written in *akaval* meter; at the beginning, it has an invocation verse and at the end in the epilogue, there is a dedicatory verse written in *veṇpā* meter.

The value of the treatise lies in the clear construction and refutation of the

---

[587] See GOODALL 2004:xxxii.

[588] *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "caṅkaṟpam" (p. 1225)*.

[589] *Tamil Lexicon. s.v. "nirākaraṇam" (p. 2266)*.

[590] Māyavātam, Aikkiyavātam, Pāṭāṇavātam, Pētavātam, Civacamavātam, Īcuvara Avikāravātam, Nimittakāraṇa Pariṇāmavātam, and Caivavātam (Cuttacaivam). See IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988:243-267.

[591] See IRATTINACAPAPATHY 1988:xiv.

doctrinal position of the sub-schools that developed away from the mainstream but are still based on the tradition of the Śaivāgamas. The *Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam* focuses on the differences between these sub-schools and the parent Śaiva Siddhānta thought. The emergence of the tributary schools from the main stream could be attributed to the differences in interpretation of the scriptural texts, which happened over time.

The *Parapakkam* part of the *Civañāṉa Cittiyār* by Aruṇanti is the other treatise of the same genre in the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta canon,[592] and it preceded the *Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam* by approximately sixty years. Aruṇanti's task involved in attacks of several systems, most of which were alien to the Śaiva Siddhānta thought and was heterogeneous in nature. Umāpati has closely followed Aruṇanti's model in marshaling his arguments; however, he is attacking sub-schools that are homogeneous in nature, except perhaps *Māyavātam* and *Aikkiyavātam*. Umāpati's *Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam* goes a step beyond Aruṇanti's *Civañāṉa Cittiyār;* it refutes the inner schools of Śaivism, which are not in total agreement with some of the doctrines of Śaiva Siddhānta.

Māyavātam is named after Advaita since its philosophy is based on *māyai*, the illusory nature of the phenomenal world. We must note the word "*māyai*" has different implications in Advaita and in Śaiva Siddhānta; Advaita treats the word as "indescribable,"[593] whereas in Śaiva Siddhānta, the word denotes a derivative power of Śiva; it is also one of the three bonds, as well as one of the categories of the system. In addition, Māyavātam can be considered an "outer" school, since it does not accept the authority of the Āgamas; *Aikkiyavātam* is also an outer school of thought, as it does not believe in the existence of *āṇavamalam*.

In the prologue, the author establishes his disdain towards the heterodox systems and states that the faultless Śaivism, which came directly from Śiva and is sustained by the Āgamas, is the true path to follow. If questioned why there should be so many Āgamas, Umāpati states that it is like calling the same gold

[592] See section 1.5.
[593] *anirvacanīya* in Sanskrit.

by different names (such as *kaṉakam*, *hiraṇyam*, *kāñcaṉam*, *īḻam*, *taṉam*, *niti*, *aṭakam*, and *tamaṉiyam*). Essentially, though there are many Āgamas, all of them speak of *pati*, *pacu* and *pācam*.[594]

In this work, just as in most of his other works in Tamil, Umāpati displays his mastery over Tamil poetics and provides his unassailable arguments in a rich language.

[594] *"kaṉakam iraṇiyam kāñcaṉam īḻam*
taṉam niti āṭakam tamaṉiyam eṉṟu ip
palapeyar payappatōr poruḷē pōlap
patipacu pāca vitimuṟai kiḷakkum." Caṅkaṟpa Nirākaraṇam 1:20-23.

5.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reference Works

A Dictionary: English and Sanskrit - Monier Williams. Fourth ed. 1989 (Reprint). New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Monier-Williams. First ed. 1986 (Reprint). New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

CHAKRABORTY, NIROD BARAN. 2003. *A Dictionary of Advaita Vedanta*. Kolkata, India: The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. 1951. X vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Encyclopedia of Religion. 2nd ed. 2005. Detroit: Macmillan Reference.

English-Tamil Dictionary. First ed. 1988 (Reprint). Madras, India: University of Madras.

GRIMES, JOHN. 1988. *A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy*. Madras (=Chennai), India: University of Madras.

HARSHANANDA, SWAMI. 1990. *A Dictionary of Advaita Vedānta*. Bangalore, India: Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama.

JOHNSON, W.J. 2009. *A Dictionary of Hinduism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

KEOWN, DAMIEN. 2004. *A Dictionary of Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Eleventh ed. 2012. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Incorporated.

MUDALIAR, SINGARAVELU A. 1988. *Apitāṉa Cintāmaṇi: The Encyclopedia of Tamil Literature*. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

POTTER, KARL. 1977. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśesika up to Gaṅgeśa*. Vol. II. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

POWERS, JOHN. 2000. *A Concise Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Oxford, England:

Oneworld Publications.

Tamil Lexicon. 1982. VI vols. Madras (=Chennai): University of Madras.

Winslow's English-Tamil Dictionary. Third ed. 1984. New Delhi, India: Asian Educational Services.

ZVELEBIL, KAMIL. 1995. *Lexicon of Tamil Literature*. New York: E.J. Brill.

Primary Sources

BRUNNER, HÉLÈNE. 1963. *Somaśambhupaddhati: (Première partie); Introduction, texte, traduction et notes*. Pondichéry, India: Institut Français d'Indologie.

CAŃKARAṆĀR, AMPAI IRĀ. 1984. *Ñāṉāmirtam (Mūlamum Uraiyum)*. Chennai: Tirunelveli South India Saivasiddhanta Publications Limited.

IḶAŃKUMARAṆ, IRĀ. 1990. *Civañāṉapōtam: Teḷiporuḷ Viḷakkam*. Chennai, India: The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society.

IRATTINACAPAPATHY, V. 1988. *Meykanta Cattirankal*. Madras: University of Madras.

MUTALIAR, CINKARAVELU. 1910. *Civanana Cittiyar - Parapakkam*. Chennai: Civanana Pota Yantracalai.

MUTALIYĀR, CAṆMUKACUNTARA. 1876. *Civañāṉacittiyār Parapakṣam ; Mūlamum Uraiyum*. Chennai, India: Ilakṣmivilās Accukkūṭam.

MUTTAPPAN, PAZHA. 2003. *Civañāṉa Cittiyār Parapakkam*. Chennai, India: Sri Agoracivacharya Trust.

NATARAJAN, B. 1991. *Tirumantiram: A Tamil Scriptural Classic*. Madras, India: Sri Ramakrishna Math.

PIḶḶAI, IRĀMANĀTA. 1975. *Civañāṉa Cittiyār Parapakkam.* Tirunelvēli, India: Teṉṉintiya Caivacittānta Nūṟpatippuk Kaḻakam.

PIḶḶAI, KĀ. CUPPIRAMAṆIYA. 1972. *Meykaṇṭa Cāttiram Patiṉāṉku*. Tinnevelly, India: The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society.

PIḶḶAI, MĪṈĀṬCICUNTARAM. 1955. *Civañāṉa Cittiyār Parapakkam*. Tiruvāṭuturai, Tamilnadu, India. : Tiruvāṭuturai Ātīṉam.

RANGACARYA, M. 2006. *Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha of Śaṅkarācārya*. New Delhi,

India: Eastern Book Linkers.

THIRUVILANGAM, MU. 2007. *Sivagnana Siddhiyar Supakkam*. Jaffna, Sri Lanka: The Jaffna Co-operative Tamil Books Publications.

Works Consulted

.

ADIDEVANANDA, SWAMI. 1974."Pancharatra and Visishtadvaita." In *Visishtadvaita Philosophy and Religion: A Symposium by Twenty-four Erudite Scholars*, edited by C. Seshachalam. Madras (=Chennai), India: Ramanuja Research Society.

ARUNACHALAM, M. 1976. "The Mysticism of Tirumular." *Indian Philosophical Annual* 11: 149-164.

AYYAR, C.V. NARAYANA. 1974. *Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India*. Madras (=Chennai), India: University of Madras.

BALASUBRAMANIAN, R. 1976. *Advaita Vedānta*. Madras, India: University of Madras.

BALASUBRAMANIAN, RANGANATHAN. 2007. "*The Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār: Transition from Bhakti to Caiva Cittāntam Philosophy*." M.A. Thesis. McGill University.

BASHAM, A. L. 1951. *History and Doctrines of The Ājīvikas: A Vanished Indian Religion*. London: Luzac & Company Ltd.

BHATT, G.S. 1966. "The Essential Philosophy of the Pancaratra School." *Darshana International* 6: 55-60.

BHATT, N.R. 2000. *La religion de Śiva d'après les sources sanskrites*. Palaiseau, France: Éditions Āgamāt.

BHATT, S.R. 1980. *The Philosophy of Pāncarātra: An Advaitic Approach*. Delhi, India: Butala & Co.

BRONKHORST, JOHANNES. 2000. "The Riddle of the Jainas and Ājīvikas in Early Buddhist Literature." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28: 511-529.

BRUNNER, HÉLÈNE. 1975-76. "Importance de la litérature āgamique pour l'étude des religions vivantes de l'Inde." *Indologica Taurinensia* 3, no. 4: 107-124.

———. 1986-92. "The Four Pādas of Śaivāgamas." *Journal of Oriental Research (Madras)* 56-62: 260-278.

———. 1992."Jñāna and Kriyā: Relation between Theory and Practice in the Śaivāgamas." In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honor of André Padoux* edited by Teun Goudriaan. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

CARPENTER, J. ESTLIN. 1921. *Theism in Medieval India*. London: William & Norgate.

CHARI, S.M.S. 2005. *Vaiṣṇavism: Its Philosophy, Theology and Religious Discipline*. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.

CHARPENTIER, JARL. 1913. "Ajivika." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*: 669-674.

COLEBROOKE, HENRY T. 2001."The Philosophy of the Hindus: On the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika Systems." In *Indian Logic: A Reader*, edited by Jonardon Ganeri. Surrey, U.K.: Curzon.

COWARD, HAROLD G. 1997. *The Sphoṭa Theory of Language: A Philosophical Analysis*. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

DASGUPTA, SURENDRANATH. 1988. *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. III. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

DAVIS, RICHARD H. 1986-1992. "Aghoraśiva's Background." *Journal of Oriental Research (Madras) (=Chennai)* 56-62: 367-378.

———. 1991. *Ritual in an Oscillating Universe*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

———. 1992."Becoming a Śiva, and Acting as One, in Śaiva Worship." In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism*, edited by Teun Goudriaan. 107-119. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

DEVASENAPATHI, V. A. 1963. *Of Human Bondage and Divine Grace*. Chidamparam, India: Annamalai University.

———. 1966. *Śaiva Siddhānta as Expounded in the Śivajñāna-Siddhiyār and its Six Commentaries*. Madras, India: University of Madras.

———. 1981. *Caivacittāntattiṉ Aṭippaṭaikaḷ*. Chennai, India: University of

Madras.

DHAVAMONY, MARIASUSAI. 1971. *Love of God according to Śaiva Siddhānta*. London: Oxford University Press.

DUNDAS, PAUL. 2002. *The Jains*. New York: Routledge.

DUNUWILA, ROHAN-A. 1985. *Śaiva Siddhānta Theology*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

FARQUHAR, J.N. 1967. *An Outline of the Religious Literature in India*. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

GANGADARAN, S. 1981. *Studies in Jñānāmṛtam*. Madurai: Madurai Kamaraj University.

———. 1992. *Saiva Siddhanta with Special Reference to Sivaprakasam*. Madurai, India: Angayarkanni Agam.

GETHIN, RUPERT. 1998. *The Foundations of Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

GHOSE, RAMA. 1984. *Grace in Śaiva Siddhānta: A Study of Tiruvaruṭpayaṉ*. Varanasi, India: Ashutosh Prakashan Sansthan.

GONDA, JAN. 1977. *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*. A History of Tamil Literature. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

GOODALL, DOMINIC. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra*. Pondicherry, India: Institut Français de Pondichéry.

———. 2000. "Problems of Name and Lineage Relationship between South Indian Authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 10, no. 2: 205-216.

———. 2004. *The Parākhyatantra: A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta*. Pondicherry, India: Institut Français de Pondichéry.

GOPALAKRISHNAN, R. 1987. *A Study of Śivajñāna Siddhiyār Parapakkam*. Madras, India: University of Madras.

GOPALAN, S. 1973. *Outlines of Jainism*. New Delhi, India: Wiley Eastern Private limites.

GOUDRIAAN, TEUN AND GUPTA, SANJUKTA. 1981. *Hindu Tantric and Śakta Literature*. History of Indian Literature. Vol. II,2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GUPTA, SANJUKTA. 1992."Yoga and Antaryāga in Pāñcarātra." Chap. 6 In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honor of André Padoux*, edited by Teun Goudriaan. 175-208. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

HARRISON, MAX HUNTER. 1932. *Hindu Monism and Pluralism*. London: Oxford University Press.

HOISINGTON, HENRY R. 1854. "Siva-Pirakâsam, Light of Sivan. A Metaphysical and Theological Treatise." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 4: 125-244.

ISHIMATSU, GINETTE. 1999. "The Making of Tamil Shaiva Siddhānta." *Indian Sociology* 33, no. 3: 571-579.

IYER, GOPAL, and FRANÇOIS GROS. 1984. *Tēvāram: Hymnes Śïvaites du Pays Tamoul*. Vol. 1, Ñāṉacampantar. Pondichéry, India: Institut Français D'Indologie.

———. 1985. *Tēvāram: Hymnes Śïvaites du Pays Tamoul*. Vol. 2, Appar et Cuntarar. Pondichéry, India: Institut Français D'Indologie.

JASH, PRANABANANDA. 1974. *History of Śaivism*. Calcutta, India: Roy and Chaudhury.

JUNANKAR, N.S. 1978. *Gautama: The Nyāya Philosophy*. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

KOPPEDRAYER, K.I. 1996. "Siva Worship as a Means of Knowing." *Saiva Siddhanta* 30, no. 1: 47-60.

KRAMRISCH, STRELLA. 1981. *The Presence of Śiva*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

MATTHEWS, GORDON. 1948. *Śiva-Jñāna-Bōdham: A Manual of Śaiva Religious Doctrine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MCGLASHAN, ALASTAIR. 2006. *The History of the Holy Servants of the Lord Siva*. Victoria, B.C.: Trafford Publishing.

MONIUS, ANNE E. 2004. "Love, Violence, and the Aesthetics of Disgust: Śaivas and Jains in Medieval South India.". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 32: 113-172.

MONIUS, ANNE E. 2004. "Śiva as Heroic Father: Theology and Hagiography in Medieval South India." *The Harvard Theological Review* 97, no. 2: 165-197.

MUDALIAR, VAJRAVELU K. 1985. *Sivajñāṉa Māpādiyam*. Madurai, India: Publications Division, Madurai Kamaraj University.

NAGASWAMY, R. 1989. *Śiva Bhakti*. New Delhi, India: Navrang.

NANDIMATH, S. C. 2001. *Theology of the Saivagamas*. Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala: International School of Dravidian Linguistics.

NARAYANAN, VASUDHA. 1987. *The Way and the Goal: Expressions of Devotion in the Early Śrī Vaiṣṇava Tradition*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Vaiṣṇava Studies.

PANDEY, K. C. 2006. *Abhinavagupta: An Historical & Philosophical Study*. Varanasi, India: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan.

PANDIT, MOTI LAL. 2010. *From Dualism to Non-Dualism: A Study of the Evolution of Śaivite Thought*. New Delhi, India: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

PETERSON, INDIRA. 1983. "Lives of the Wandering Singers: Pilgrimage and Poetry in Tamil Śivite Hagiography." *History of Religions* 22, no. 4: 338-360.

———. 1989. *Poems to Śiva: The Hymns of the Tamil Saints*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

PIET, JOHN H. 1952. *A Logical Presentation of the Śaiva Siddhānta Philosophy*. Madras (=Chennai), India: The Christian Literature Society for India.

PILLAI, J. M. NALLASWAMI. 1984. *Sivagnana Botham of Meikanda Deva*. Madras, India: The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society.

PILLAI, NALLASWAMI J. M. 1913. *Sivajnana Siddhiyar of Arunandi Sivacharya*. Madras, India: Meykandan Press.

———. 1945. *Thiruvarutpayan of Umapathi Sivacharya*. Dharmapuram, India: The Gnanasambandam Press

———. 1984. *Studies in Saiva Siddhanta*. Madras, India: The South Indi Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society.

POPE, GORDON U. 1979. *Tiruvaçagam: Sacred Utterances of the Tamil Poet,*

Saint, and Sage Māṇikka-Vāçagar. Madras (=Chennai), India: University of Madras.

PRENTISS, KAREN. 1999. *The Embodiment of Bhakti*. New York: Oxford University Press.

PRETS, ERNST. 2001. "Futile and False Rejoinders, Sophistical Arguments and Early Indian Logic." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29: 545-558.

RADHAKRISHNAN, S. 1989. *Indian Philosophy (Vol. 1)*. Madras, India: Oxford University Press.

———. 1989. *Indian Philosophy (Vol. 2)*. Madras, India: Oxford University Press.

———. 1989. *The Principal Upaniṣads*. Madras (=Chennai), India: Oxford University Press.

RAJA, KUNJUNNI K. 1977. *Indian Theories of Meaning*. Madras (=Chennai): The Adyar Library and Research Centre.

SANDERSON, ALEXIS. 1988." Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions." In *The World's Religions*, edited by S. Sutherland and et al., 660-704. London: Routledge.

———. 2006. *Meaning in Tāntric Ritual*. New Delhi, India: Tantra Foundation.

———. 2007."The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir." In *Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux. 231-442. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry.

———. 2009."The Saiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Saivism during the Early Medieval Period." In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, edited by Einoo Shingo. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series, 23., 41-350. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.

SASTRI, S.S. SURYANARAYANA. 1972. *The Śivādvaita of Śrīkaṇṭha*. Madras: University of Madras.

SCHOMERUS, H. W. 2000. *Śaiva Siddhānta: An Indian School of Mystical Thought*. New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

SCHRADER, F. OTTO. 1973. *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*. Madras (=Chennai), India: The Theosophical Publishing House.

SHASTRI, GAURINATH. 1939. "The Doctrine of Sabdabrahman—A Criticism by Jayantabhaṭṭa: Grammarian's Position Reviewed." *The Indian Historical*

Quarterly XV, no. 1: 441-453.

SIDDALINGAIAH, T.B. 1979. *Origin and Development of Saiva Siddhanta Upto 14th Century*. Madurai: Madurai Kamaraj University.

SIVARAMAN, KRISHNA. 1973. *Śaivism in Philosophical Perspective*. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

———. 1983."The Role of the Śaivāgama in the Emergence of Śaivasiddhānta: A Philosophical Interpretation." In *Traditions in Contact and Change: Selected Proceedings of the XIVth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions*, edited by Peter Slater & Donald Wiebe. 52-64. Waterloo, Ontario: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion.

———. 1988. *Civañāṉa Cittiyār Cupakkam*. Varanasi, India: Sri Kasimatam.

SIVATHAMBY, KARTHIGESU. 1978. "The Politics of a Literary Style." *Social Scientist* 6, no. 8: 16-33.

SOLOMON, ESTHER A. 1976. *Indian Dialectics (vol. 1)*. Ahmedabad, India: Gujarat Vidya Sabha.

———. 1978. *Indian Dialectics (vol. 2)*. Ahmedabad, India: Gujarat Vidya Sabha.

TODESCHINI, ALBERTO. 2010. "Twenty-Two Ways to Lose a Debate: A Gricean Look at the *Nyāyasūtra*'s Points of Defeat." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 38: 49-74.

TOKUNAGA, MUNEO. 1981. "Civañāṉacittiyār, Parapakkam sts. 264-301." *Indological Review (Indogakuhō)* 3: 1-18.

TORELLA, RAFFAELE. 1994. *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā of Utpaladeva with the Author's Vṛtti*. New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

VANMIKANATHAN, G. 1985. *Periya Puranam: A Tamil Classic on the Great Saiva Saints of South India*. Madras, India: Sri Ramakrishna Math.

VELUPPILLAI, ALVAPILLAI. 2002."Tamil Texts Related to Pauttam." In *Buddhism among Tamils in Pre-colonial Tamilakam and Ilam*. 785-834. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.

VIDYABHUSANA, SATISH CHANDRA. 1988 (Reprint). *A History of Indian Logic: Ancient, Mediaval, and Modern Schools*. Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

WOODROFFE, JOHN, and M.P. PANDIT. 1984. *Kulārṇava Tantra*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

YOUNGER, PAUL. 1995. *The Home of Dancing Śivaṉ: The Traditions of the Hindu Temple in Citamparam*. New York: Oxford University Press.

ZIMMER, HEINRICH. 1974. *Philosophies of India*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

ZVELEBIL, KAMIL. 1973. *The Smile of Murugan: On Tamil Literature of South India*. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.

———. 1974. *Tamil Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.